DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 707 CE 057 156

AUTHOR Dittenhafer, Clarence A., Comp.
TITLE Vocational Professional Personnel Preparation in Pennsylvania. A Client Survey.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 115p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teacher Induction; *Competency Based Teacher Education; Counseling Services; Extension Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Certification; Teacher Interns; Teacher Placement; Teacher Workshops; Transitional Programs; Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A study determined the effectiveness of Pennsylvania professional development centers in the preparation of vocational teachers. The study used the perceptions of participants to ascertain the effectiveness in the various activities for which the centers receive state and federal funds. Vocational teachers responded to questions about nine center services: (1) pedagogical and technical workshops; (2) conventional off-campus courses; (3) pedagogical competencies for uncertified teachers; (4) competency-based internships; (5) competency-based programs; (6) professional problems assistance; (7) prospective teacher assistance; (8) economic system for meeting state certification requirements; and (9) statewide placement system. The study population was limited to 373 vocational teachers with 1-5 years of service who had completed the survey instrument. Based on the conclusions and supporting data in this study, five recommendations were made: (1) strategies for updating vocational teachers should be developed and implemented; (2) a review of off-campus offerings should be conducted; (3) industry-to-classroom transitional services should be reviewed and addressed if the need is real; (4) financial assistance should be provided to individuals from industry for the minimum credits required to become certified teachers; and (5) placement activities should be eliminated as a center work program. (Four references, 30 tables, and 4 appendices are included. Appendix A includes a postcard survey, Appendix B includes a cover letter and questionnaire, Appendix C lists the institutions from which respondents graduated from and/or participated in courses designed to meet the certifications, and Appendix D includes written comments taken from the surveys completed by the respondents.) (NLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

8419

ED329707

VOCATIONAL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL PREPARATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

A Client Survey

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R R Brickley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pennsylvania Department of Education 1987

CE 057 156

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Robert P. Casey, Governor

Department of Education
Thomas K. Gilhool, Secretary

Office of Basic Education
W. R. Logan, Commissioner (Acting)

Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education
Jerry C. Olson, Director

Division of Vocational Education Planning,
Development and Evaluation Services
William J. Reilly, Chief

Compiled by Clarence A. Dittenhafer

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

May 1987

The Pennsylvania Department of Education, an equal opportunity employer, will not discriminate in employment, educational programs or activities, based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, ancestry, physical handicap or union membership. This policy of nondiscrimination extends to all other legally protected classifications. Publication of this policy in this document is in accordance with state and federal laws including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Inquiries should be directed to Susan Mitchell, Affirmative Action Officer, 503/504 Coordinator, Education Building, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter

I. BACKGROUND 1

Statement of the Problem 4

Questions to be Answered 4

II. METHODS 7

Sample 8

Placement Sample 10

III. RESULTS 12

Question 1 12

Question 2 15

Question 3 18

Question 4 21

Question 5 24

Question 6 27

Question 7 30

Question 8 33

Placement Activity 36

Question 9 36

IV. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 41

Question 1 41
Question 2 42
Question 3 43
Question 4 43
Question 5 44
Question 6 45
Question 7 45
Question 8 47
Placement Activity 48
Question 9 48
Recommendations 49

REFERENCES 52

APPENDIX A 53

APPENDIX B 54

APPENDIX C 73

APPENDIX D 74

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Sampling Matrix of Vocational Educators with One to Five Years' Experience (1980-85) 9

2. Sampling Matrix of Vocational Instructors Hired in the Years 1982-84 11

3. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist A by Institution 13

4. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist A by Current Employment 14

5. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist A 15

6. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist B by Institution 16

7. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist B by Current Employment 17

8. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist B 18

9. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist C by Institution 19

10. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist C by Current Employment 20

11. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist C 21

12. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist D by Institution 22

13. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist D by Current Employment 23

14. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist D 24

15. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist E by Institution 25

16. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist E by Current Employment 26

17. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist E 27

18. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist F by Institution 28

19. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist F by Current Employment 29

20. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist F 30

21. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist G by Institution 31

22. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist G by Current Employment 32

23. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist G 33

24. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist H by Institution 34

25. Crosstabulations of Responses to Items on Checklist H by Current Employment 35

26. Summary of Responses to Individual Items on Checklist H 36

27. Crosstabulations of Responses to Teacher Placement Survey by Type of School (Present Employer) 37

28. Crosstabulations of Responses to Teacher Placement Survey by Subject Taught 38

29. Crosstabulations of Responses to Teacher Placement Survey by Degree 39

30. Crosstabulations of Responses to Teacher Placement Survey by Certification 40

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

The present professional development center concept evolved in the late 1970s from a desire to more effectively utilize dwindling fiscal resources. The facts supported the need for a master plan for Pennsylvania's vocational education professional development system. The plan included a new strategy for state and federal support of the system. The guiding principle behind the new funding scheme was that funds be provided for those activities which were not traditional collegiate endeavors.

The culmination of the above efforts was the establishment of the vocational education professional development centers at Temple University, The Pennsylvania State University, the University of Pittsburgh and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Each center was to use a "critical mass" of appropriate resources in a manner that is flexible and responsive to the priority staff development needs of vocational educators. The geographic location of the centers was designed to promote efficient and effective use of funds.

In a summary about the professional development centers, Swatt (1977) wrote:

> "...this paper proposes offering project funding to many Commonwealth colleges and universities and by allocating basic funding to institutions that (1) receive PDE approval of a plan to meet specified objectives and become recognized

> as a Center for the Preparation and Development of Vocational Education Professional Personnel and (2) demonstrate effective achievement of the specified objectives.
>
> This plan is based upon the position that professional personnel development services can be provided effectively and efficiently through a comprehensive delivery system with sufficient resources to respond quickly and flexibly to meet identified needs of the prospective and practicing vocational educators. In addition, it emphasizes strong professional relationship among PDE, collegiate and local staff members, and it requires an unprecedented degree of accountability by recipients of the funding support.
>
> This plan rejects a 'grab bag' approach to providing needed services in favor of a system that promotes sound management at the collegiate level, influential involvement at the secondary school level and effective direction and coordination at the state level." (p. 20)

Various evaluative studies have been conducted over the years since the centers' inception. An Appalachia Educational Laboratory (1979) attempted to catalog the various center activities for the period July 1978 through the dates of the fourth and final visit to each center--ranging from January 24 through June 10, 1979. The report contained a fiscal and programmatic description of each center. In addition, each center's progress toward its selected PDE objectives, as measured against prescribed criteria, was documented. The report showed that the centers were in various stages of development for the time period studied.

Adamsky (1981) assessed Temple University's implementation of a field-based, competency-based system to prepare vocational teachers. The system was a major component in Temple's vocational professional development center. The 232 vocational students who were the subjects of the study participated in the system during the 1980-81 fiscal year. Through questionnaires information was obtained from the students as well as the field resource staff and local administrators. The findings resulted in the following conclusions:

"1. The program continues to operate as it was designed with a few minor dysfunctions; namely,

   a. not all students have an in-school resident resource person to help them.

   b. not all students are having their teaching observed once each week.

   c. not all students are being provided with small group activity once each month.

2. Local school administrators seem to have an extensive understanding of the program and favor the way it was designed to operate.

3. The students in the program feel that the modules that they use are addressing essential teaching skills and helping them become better vocational teachers.

4. The students in the program feel that Temple field resource persons are very helpful.

5. The students in the program have no desire to take time-based courses rather than be involved in modularized instruction. In fact, they feel the modularized instruction is not as difficult as taking courses.

6. The students in the program value vocational teacher education." (p. 23, 24)

The Adamsky study was significant to the research in this report because he elicited responses about similar topics from a comparable population. The other significant factor is that the Temple field-based model has been implemented in some form in the other centers. A major drawback of Adamsky's study was that it assessed only one activity in one center and lacked generalizability to the state. Thus, a more comprehensive assessment was necessary to provide the information needed for better decisionmaking by the Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed by this study is to determine the effectiveness of professional development centers in the preparation of vocational teachers. The study uses the perceptions of participants to ascertain effectiveness in the various activities for which the centers receive state and federal funds .

Questions to be Answered

In pursuing information related to the above problem, it was essential to have vocational teachers respond to items related to the activities offered by the respective centers. Therefore, the activities provided the basis for the formulation of the following questions:

1. Were pedagogical and technical workshops provided for updating instructors in the various program areas of vocational education?

2. Were conventional off-campus courses provided for preservice and in-service vocational educators who were not served through a field-based, competency-based teacher education and leadership program?

3. Were pedagogical competencies provided to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified?

4. Were competency-based internships provided for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors of vocational education and for students developing curriculum specialist competencies?

5. Were competency-based programs provided for teaching the necessary instructor competencies for establishing and operating vocational student organizations?

6. Was assistance provided to beginning teachers including persons with baccalaureate degrees in solving a wide range of professional problems?

7. Was assistance provided to prospective teachers in making the difficult transition from industry to the vocational classroom/laboratory?

8. Was an economical system provided whereby beginning teachers, usually from business and industry, could meet the state's requirements for certification?

9. Was a statewide placement system established to assist vocational educators in finding employment as teachers, supervisors or administrators?

It must be mentioned that not all the centers offered all the services cited in the above questions. The services were offered selectively based on demand, available resources and other factors peculiar to each center.

Information on each of the above questions was obtained from a six-item checklist. The data from the individual questions provided the basis for

analyzing the relative merits of each center activity. Individual item analysis was undertaken to determine if all the contributing elements were consistent with the overall results on each checklist.

In the first chapter the researcher developed a historical perspective for the evaluation of the vocational education professional personnel development centers. The findings in this study should provide information to assist PDE managers in making decisions about the future directions of vocational personnel development.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Early in the study it was decided that data was needed directly from participants in the activities conducted by the vocational personnel development centers. Also, it was felt that the premises upon which the centers were established and funded needed to be assessed.

Initially, participants were identified and mailed a survey (see Appendix A) containing evaluative questions about their activities. The returned surveys supplied the response data for evaluating the effectiveness of the activities.

The statewide placement system was used as a pilot for the above procedure. The population was identified and postcard surveys were mailed in the winter of 1985. A total of 467 postcards were mailed with 200 usable returns.

The postcard survey worked well. However, upon considering the time involved, the population surveyed, the number of activities needing evaluation and other factors, the procedure was deemed inappropriate. It was decided that a single survey instrument would need to be developed to assess the remaining eight activities. The instrument was developed in the summer of 1985. After several revisions resulting from various reviews, the survey instrument (see Appendix B) was finalized in the fall of 1985.

The instrument was divided into two parts. Part I was a background information sheet designed to gather preliminary data from the respondents. The data included present employment, years of experience in vocational education, participation in teacher preparation programs and their higher education institution. If respondents did not participate in any of the center activities, they merely completed the background information and mailed the questionnaire to the PDE.

Those who did participate in center activities were asked to complete Part II of the instrument. Part II attempted to elicit responses relevant to the remaining (other than the placement system) fundable activities. Each of the activities was listed at the top of a checklist followed by an explanatory paragraph and six evaluative questions about the activity. Space was also provided for comments after each of the six questions on the checklists. A forced-choice format was used to obtain information on each question with the response categories being "Yes," "No" and "Not Applicable." Respondents were to complete checklists for only those activities in which they participated.

Sample

The "center" concept for personnel development evolved during the mid-70s and was not fully operational until 1978-79. It was determined by the researcher and others that individuals would not be able to evaluate center activities until the 1980s. Therefore, a decision was made to limit the population to those vocational educators with one to five years of service.

Several other conditions were taken into consideration when selecting the sample. First, because of the large number of teachers in home economics, industrial arts and business education, only 33.3 percent of the teachers in these fields received surveys. Of course, the teachers in these fields already have a bachelor's degree and probably did not participate in many of the center activities. Second, the numbers in all other fields were much smaller so all the identified individuals received surveys. The fields include directors, supervisors, coordinators, vocational guidance counselors and instructors in agriculture, trade and industrial, health occupations, marketing and technical education. The population and sample configuration for the above is depicted in Table 1 as well as the number of respondents in each category:

TABLE 1

SAMPLING MATRIX OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS WITH ONE TO FIVE YEARS' EXPERIENCE (1980-85)

Current Employment	Total Population	Sample Percent	Sample Number	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents by Employment	Respondents as Percent of Total Sample
Director/Principal	7	100.0	7	2	28.6	.54
Supervisor	3	100.0	3	2	67.0	.54
Coordinator	4	100.0	4	4	100.0	1.07
Guidance Counselor	1	100.0	1	1	100.0	.27
Instructor						
Agriculture	30	100.0	30	14	46.7	3.75
Home Economics	315	33.3	104	40	46.7	10.72
Trade and Industrial	345	100.0	344	219	66.7	58.71
Industrial Arts	204	33.3	68	12	17.6	3.22
Health Occupations	50	100.0	50	32	64.0	8.58
Marketing	11	100.0	11	5	45.5	1.34
Business Education	102	33.3	34	19	55.9	5.09
Technical Education	28	100.0	28	23	82.1	6.17
TOTAL	1,100		684	373		100.00

The above response rate overall was 54.5 percent. The highest group rate as a percent of the total was in the trade and industrial area with 58.71 percent. This area was the one toward which most center services were directed. Thus, it appeared that the sampling methodology was valid to yield the information necessary to answer the questions about center activities.

Placement Sample

As indicated earlier the initial pilot survey used a postcard to determine the status of the vocational placement system instituted by the centers. The sample for the placement survey consisted of those vocational personnel hired in the years 1982 through 1984. Many of the same individuals completed both survey instruments. However, the placement sample (Table 2) was smaller due to the fewer number of years covered by the survey.

TABLE 2

SAMPLING MATRIX OF VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS HIRED IN THE YEARS 1982-84

Program Area	Sample Size (Number)	Respondents (Number)	Respondents (Percent of Total)
Agriculture	35	15	7.5
Business	103	44	22.0
Marketing	7	3	1.5
Health	23	10	5.0
Industrial Arts	35	15	7.5
Technical	17	7	3.5
Trade and Industrial	126	54	27.0
Home Economics	121	52	26.0
TOTAL	467	200	100.0

The overall response rate for the placement study was 42.83 percent with a proportional return across program areas; that is, the program areas with the largest number of newly hired instructors showed the highest response rate.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The presentation of the findings was dictated by the study design. The results evolved around the major survey of vocational teachers to ascertain their perceptions of how well they were prepared to teach. Specifically, the questions responded to in the survey dealt with the activities for which the four vocational teacher preparation centers received funds. While the placement survey was not included in the overall survey, the results are reported here because it was a fundable center activity during the study period.

The results were obtained from the summarized responses of vocational educators to the various items on the checklists. Each question is stated followed by a tabular display of the responses to it. Each question is a summation of six individual items relating to a center activity. As in Chapter II the placement component results are treated separately even though they were an integral part of center activities during the survey period.

Question 1 - Were pedagogical and technical workshops provided for updating instructors in the various program areas of vocational education?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5. Table 3 shows the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist A.

The crosstabulations were by the institution from which the subjects graduated and/or participated in courses to meet various vocational certifications.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST A BY INSTITUTION

	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
Institution	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	174	67.4	73	28.3	7	2.7	4	1.6	258	29.5
Pittsburgh	147	61.3	72	30.0	15	6.3	6	2.5	240	27.4
Temple	129	58.1	79	35.6	11	5.0	3	1.4	222	25.3
Indiana	96	76.2	24	19.0	4	3.2	2	1.6	126	14.4
Other	20	66.7	10	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	3.4
TOTAL	566	64.6	258	29.5	37	4.2	15	1.7	876	100.0

The data showed that nearly all (96.6%) of the responses were from individuals who were enrolled at one of the four professional development centers. The other 3.4 percent came from a variety of institutions (see Appendix C for complete listing). It did not seem to matter where the responses came from as the respondents were very positive relative to the updating workshops.

In Table 4 the same responses were crosstabulated by the respondents' current employment. Clearly, the positive responses are not clustered around any one area of employment. However, the largest number of responses came from trade and industry teachers. These teachers were the prime audience for which the center concept was implemented.

TABLE 4

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST A BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	0.7
Supervisor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Coordinator	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.7
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	45	68.2	17	25.8	2	3.0	2	3.0	66	7.5
Trade and Industry	361	61.4	192	32.7	24	4.1	11	1.9	588	67.1
Home Economics	57	73.1	17	21.8	3	3.8	1	1.3	78	8.9
Industrial Arts	14	77.8	4	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	2.1
Health Occupations	24	66.7	8	22.2	4	11.1	0	0.0	36	4.1
Marketing	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	1.4
Business	14	58.3	7	29.2	2	8.3	1	4.2	24	2.7
Technical	30	71.4	11	26.2	1	2.4	0	0.0	42	4.8
TOTAL	566	64.6	258	29.5	37	4.2	15	1.7	876	100.0

In Table 5 responses to the individual items on Checklist A are shown. The importance of the table lies in the fact that one can determine the internal consistency of the responses across each item on the checklist compared to the overall data cited in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST A

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Hands-On Experience	102	69.9	31	21.2	12	8.2	1	0.7
2. University Responsibility	77	52.7	63	43.2	3	2.1	3	2.1
3. Skills Usable in Classroom	125	85.6	14	9.6	7	4.8	0	0.0
4. Helpful in Updating Competence	107	73.3	36	24.7	3	2.1	0	0.0
5. Opportunity for Input on Offerings	52	35.6	86	58.9	3	2.1	5	3.4
6. Satisfaction with Workshop	103	70.5	28	19.2	9	6.2	6	4.1

An examination of the data revealed consistency with two exceptions. First, item 2, instructor updating as a university responsibility, showed only a 52.7 to 43.2 percent positive response. The other nonconforming item (5) asked if instructors had any input into the kinds of updating workshops offered by the centers. Only 35.6 percent of the responses were affirmative, while 58.9 percent indicated no input into the planning of the workshops.

Question 2 - Were conventional off-campus courses provided for preservice and in-service vocational educators who were not served through a field-based, competency-based teacher education and leadership program?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 6, 7 and 8. Table 6 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist B. The crosstabulations were by the institution from which the subjects graduated and/or participated in courses to meet various vocational certifications.

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST B BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	184	61.3	96	32.0	16	5.3	4	1.3	300	27.5
Pittsburgh	138	59.0	74	31.6	16	6.8	6	2.6	234	21.4
Temple	252	67.7	100	26.9	18	4.8	2	0.5	372	34.1
Indiana	96	57.1	52	31.0	14	8.3	6	3.6	168	15.4
Other	13	72.2	3	16.7	2	11.1	0	0.0	18	1.6
TOTAL	683	62.5	325	29.8	66	6.0	18	1.6	1,092	100.0

The table showed that at all the institutions nearly two-thirds (62.5%) of the responses were positive and ranged from a high of 67.7 percent to a low of 57.1 percent. The noncenter institutions contributed only 18 of the responses, but their percentages were very similar to those for the centers.

In Table 7 the same responses were crosstabulated by the respondents' current employment. It showed most of the responses were positive across all areas of employment. Supervisors and coordinators, while small in number of responses, were split 50/50 in their "Yes"/"No" answers. Directors/principals, on the other hand, had a 75 percent positive rate.

TABLE 7

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST B BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	9	75.0	3	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	1.1
Supervisor	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.5
Coordinator	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.5
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	25	59.5	14	33.3	3	7.1	0	0.0	42	3.8
Trade and Industry	463	60.8	238	31.2	48	6.3	13	1.7	762	69.8
Home Economics	72	66.7	27	25.0	6	5.6	3	2.8	108	9.9
Industrial Arts	14	77.8	3	16.7	1	5.6	0	0.0	18	1.6
Health Occupations	37	77.1	11	22.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	4.4
Marketing	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.5
Business	21	70.0	7	23.3	2	6.7	0	0.0	30	2.7
Technical	31	57.4	15	27.8	6	11.1	2	3.7	54	4.9
TOTAL	683	62.5	325	29.8	66	6.0	18	1.6	1,092	100.0

Table 8 showed the responses to the individual items on Checklist B. All of the results favor off-campus courses. In fact, item 6 (Would you prefer that all vocational teacher preparation be offered through off-campus courses?) showed a 73.6 percent positive response. Although item 4 (Did the off-campus courses hamper communications between you and on-campus university staff?) showed a 78.6 percent negative response, it was actually favorable because of the inverse nature of the item. If communications with on-campus university staff were not hampered by taking courses off-campus, then one would have expected a high number of "No" responses. The results clearly indicated no communications gap due to being off-campus.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST B

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Easy Commuting Distance	149	81.9	31	17.0	0	0.0	2	1.1
2. Courses Repeated Often Enough	108	59.3	57	31.3	12	6.6	5	2.7
3. Taught by Full-Time Staff	138	75.8	29	15.9	13	7.1	2	1.1
4. Hamper Communications	25	13.7	143	78.6	14	7.7	0	0.0
5. Necessary Resources Available	129	70.9	30	16.5	23	12.6	0	0.0
6. Prefer All Courses Off-Campus	134	73.6	35	19.2	4	2.2	9	4.9

Question 3 - Were pedagogical competencies provided to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 9, 10 and 11. Table 9 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist C. The crosstabulations were by the institution from which the subjects graduated and/or participated in courses to meet various vocational certifications.

TABLE 9

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST C BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	343	76.2	89	19.8	15	3.3	3	0.7	450	29.4
Pittsburgh	249	78.3	58	18.2	9	2.8	2	0.6	318	20.8
Temple	360	72.3	128	25.7	10	2.0	0	0.0	498	32.5
Indiana	205	79.5	43	16.7	4	1.6	6	2.3	258	16.9
Other	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	0.4
TOTAL	1,159	75.8	321	21.0	39	2.5	11	0.7	1,530	100.0

The data (Table 9) showed that slightly over 75 percent of all responses were positive. Temple University and noncenter institutions fell below the average at 72.3 and 33.3 percent, respectively.

In Table 10 the same responses were crosstabulated by the respondents' current employment. The responses were all very positive about areas of employment. The directors/principals, supervisors and coordinators, although small in number, were nearly unanimous in their positive responses to the items on the checklist. Other very positive responses came from marketing (91.7%) and industrial arts (88.9%). Even home economics and trade and industry, with the highest number of responses, had positive rates of 79.8 and 75.5 percent, respectively. The lowest rates were in technical (69.4%) and business (64.3%).

TABLE 10

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST C BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES: Yes Freq.	Yes %	No Freq.	No %	Not Applicable Freq.	Not Applicable %	None Freq.	None %	TOTAL Freq.	TOTAL %
Director/Principal	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.4
Supervisor	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.4
Coordinator	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.4
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	22	73.3	5	16.7	3	10.0	0	0.0	30	2.0
Trade and Industry	820	75.5	225	20.7	32	2.9	9	0.8	1,086	71.0
Home Economics	91	79.8	22	19.3	1	0.9	0	0.0	114	7.5
Industrial Arts	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	1.2
Health Occupations	80	78.4	19	18.6	2	2.0	1	1.0	102	6.7
Marketing	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	0.8
Business	27	64.3	14	33.3	1	2.4	0	0.0	42	2.7
Technical	75	69.4	32	29.6	0	0.0	1	0.9	108	7.1
TOTAL	1,159	75.8	321	21.0	39	2.5	11	0.7	1,530	100.0

Table 11 showed the responses to the individual items on Checklist C. Positive response rates were in the 75 to 90 percent range for five of the six items on the checklist. The one negative response percentage was item 6 (Did the field-based program enable you to utilize the full range of university services normally provided to students in more conventional teacher preparation programs?). The rates for item 6 were 43.1 percent "Yes" and 46.3 percent "No," respectively.

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST C

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Definitive Plan of Studies	225	88.2	24	9.4	5	2.0	1	0.4
2. Modules Valuable	224	87.8	28	11.0	2	0.8	1	0.4
3. Provide Teacher Interaction	192	75.3	56	22.0	6	2.4	1	0.4
4. Help Understand Issues	211	82.7	42	16.5	2	0.8	0	0.0
5. Provide Staff Interaction	197	77.3	53	20.8	3	1.2	2	0.8
6. Utilize University Services	110	43.1	118	46.3	21	8.2	6	2.4

Question 4 - Were competency-based internships provided for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors of vocational education and for students developing curriculum specialist competencies?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 12, 13 and 14. Table 12 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist D. The crosstabulations were by institution. Responses overall were quite positive with a high of 78.6 percent and a low of 65.0 percent. Most of the negative responses were below the 20 percent range. Only Penn State and Temple were over 20 percent at 22.5 and 25.7 percent, respectively. Interestingly, noncenter institutions had no respondents.

TABLE 12

CROSSTABLULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST D BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	78	65.0	27	22.5	14	11.7	1	0.8	120	21.7
Pittsburgh	101	70.1	24	16.7	14	9.7	5	3.5	144	26.1
Temple	149	73.0	48	23.5	6	2.9	1	0.5	204	37.0
Indiana	66	78.6	11	13.1	5	6.0	2	2.4	84	15.2
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	394	71.4	110	19.9	39	7.1	9	1.6	552	100.0

In Table 13 the same crosstabulations across current employment showed more variation with coordinators (33.3%) and business teachers (58.3%) being less positive than all the other employment areas. However, the two groups were quite low in number of responses with 6 and 7, respectively. The other areas of employment showed positive rates at or near 70 percent.

TABLE 13

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST D BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	1.1
Supervisor	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.1
Coordinator	2	33.3	4	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.1
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	25	69.4	5	13.9	5	13.9	1	2.8	36	6.5
Trade and Industry	280	71.8	77	19.7	25	6.4	8	2.1	390	70.7
Home Economics	34	70.8	11	22.9	3	6.3	0	0.0	48	8.7
Industrial Arts	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	2.2
Health Occupations	10	83.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	12	2.2
Marketing	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	1.1
Business	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	12	2.2
Technical	13	72.2	3	16.7	2	11.1	0	0.0	18	3.3
TOTAL	394	71.4	110	19.9	39	7.1	9	1.6	552	100.0

Table 14 showed the responses to the individual items on Checklist D are shown. The high positive response rates held for all items except numbers 3 and 6. In item 3 (Was the field-based leadership program less costly than a conventional campus-based program would have been?) slightly over 50 percent of the responses were positive, while 32.6 percent were negative. Item 6 (Was the university instrumental in helping you secure a suitable internship?) showed similar response rates--53.3 percent positive and 26.1 percent negative. In item 6 17.4 percent of the responses were in the "Not Applicable" category.

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST D

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Consistent with Program	67	72.8	20	21.7	5	5.4	0	0.0
2. Planned Competencies	79	85.9	11	12.0	2	2.2	0	0.0
3. Cost Efficient	52	56.5	30	32.6	7	7.6	3	3.3
4. Reinforcement from Resource Persons	71	77.2	16	17.4	5	5.4	0	0.0
5. Theory into Practice	76	82.6	9	9.8	4	4.3	3	3.3
6. University Help Get Internship	49	53.3	24	26.1	16	17.4	3	3.3

Question 5 - Were competency-based programs provided for teaching the necessary instructor competencies for establishing and operating vocational student organizations?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 15, 16 and 17. Table 15 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist E. The crosstabulations were by institution. The data indicated a great deal of stability across all institutions with two-thirds or more of the responses being positive except for the noncenter institutions who were negative.

TABLE 15

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST E BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	178	64.5	90	32.6	8	2.9	0	0.0	276	26.7
Pittsburgh	166	65.9	67	26.6	15	6.0	4	1.6	252	24.4
Temple	203	65.1	99	31.7	8	2.6	2	0.6	312	30.2
Indiana	118	67.8	48	27.6	3	1.7	5	2.9	174	16.9
Other	4	22.2	11	61.1	1	5.6	2	11.1	18	1.7
TOTAL	669	64.8	315	30.5	35	3.4	13	1.3	1,032	100.0

In Table 16 a similar situation was exhibited in the crosstabulations by current employment; that is, two-thirds of the responses across areas of employment were positive with two exceptions. Business and industrial arts were lower with positive percentages of 47.2 and 50.0, respectively.

TABLE 16

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST E BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES								TOTAL	
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	0.6
Supervisor	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Coordinator	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Guidance Counselor	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	30	71.4	11	26.2	1	2.4	0	0.0	42	4.1
Trade and Industry	454	63.6	227	31.8	25	3.5	8	1.1	714	69.2
Home Economics	55	65.5	24	28.6	5	6.0	0	0.0	84	8.1
Industrial Arts	6	50.0	6	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	1.2
Health Occupations	52	78.8	11	16.7	1	1.5	2	3.0	66	6.4
Marketing	10	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	12	1.2
Business	17	47.2	16	44.4	2	5.6	1	2.8	36	3.5
Technical	26	61.9	16	38.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	42	4.1
TOTAL	669	64.8	315	30.5	35	3.4	13	1.3	1,032	100.0

In examining the responses to the individual items on Checklist E (Table 17), the same response pattern emerged. Thus, practically all the items showed two-thirds positive responses. A somewhat ironic situation was evident in the responses to item 2 (Would an in-service workshop be as effective as the field-based approach in providing the vocational student organization competencies?) with 69.2 percent of the responses being positive. One would have expected a much lower positive response rate if the field-based approach was unique and strongly supported.

TABLE 17

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST E

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Competencies to Organize and Operate VSOs	128	74.4	36	20.9	8	4.7	0	0.0
2. In-service Workshop as Effective	119	69.2	43	25.0	8	4.7	2	1.2
3. Mastery of VSO Competencies a Requirement	104	60.5	58	33.7	7	4.1	3	1.7
4. Formal Instruction Necessary	105	61.0	58	33.7	7	4.1	2	1.2
5. Presently Advise a VSO	103	59.9	65	37.8	1	0.6	3	1.7
6. Mastery of VSO Competencies a Future Requirement	110	64.0	55	32.0	4	2.3	3	1.7

Question 6 - Was assistance provided to beginning teachers including persons with baccalaureate degrees in solving a wide range of professional problems?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 18, 19 and 20. Table 18 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist F. The crosstabulations were by institution. It shows a great deal of stability across all institutions with a 74 percent average positive response.

TABLE 18

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST F BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	221	69.5	84	26.4	12	3.8	1	0.3	318	30.3
Pittsburgh	121	72.0	39	23.2	5	3.0	3	1.8	168	16.0
Temple	285	77.9	74	20.2	6	1.6	1	0.3	366	34.9
Indiana	135	77.6	32	18.4	6	3.4	1	0.6	174	16.6
Other	15	62.5	9	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	2.3
TOTAL	777	74.0	238	22.7	29	2.8	6	0.6	1,050	100.0

Similar results were exhibited for the crosstabulations by current employment, Table 19. The average positive response was 74.0 percent. However, industrial arts was only 58.3 percent indicating less assistance in solving educational problems.

TABLE 19

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST F BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES								TOTAL	
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Supervisor	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Coordinator	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	32	76.2	8	19.0	2	4.8	0	0.0	42	4.0
Trade and Industry	524	74.0	161	22.7	17	2.4	6	0.8	708	67.4
Home Economics	61	72.6	21	25.0	2	2.4	0	0.0	84	8.0
Industrial Arts	7	58.3	5	41.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	1.1
Health Occupations	51	77.3	11	16.7	4	6.1	0	0.0	66	6.3
Marketing	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.6
Business	22	73.3	8	26.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	2.9
Technical	60	71.4	20	23.8	4	4.8	0	0.0	84	8.0
TOTAL	777	74.0	238	22.7	29	2.8	6	0.6	1,050	100.0

An examination of the individual item responses (Table 20) on Checklist F revealed five of the six items over 75 percent positive. Item 3 (Did you receive your baccalaureate degree before participating in the program?) had a positive response rate of 21.1 percent. This rate was in keeping with the mission of the personnel development centers. They were designed primarily to serve individuals coming directly from industry, usually without a degree. Thus, in most cases not having a degree before entering the program was not objectionable.

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST F

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. University Assist in Module Selection	148	84.6	23	13.1	4	2.3	0	0.0
2. Modules Relevant to Needs	159	90.9	14	8.0	2	1.1	0	0.0
3. Degree Before Participating in Program	37	21.1	127	72.6	10	5.7	1	0.6
4. Resource Personnel Provide Support	149	85.1	24	13.7	1	0.6	1	0.6
5. Complete All the Modules Needed	135	77.1	34	19.4	4	2.3	2	1.1
6. Receive Effective Feedback	149	85.1	16	9.1	8	4.6	2	1.1

Question 7 - Was assistance provided to prospective teachers in making the difficult transition from industry to the vocational classroom/laboratory?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 21, 22 and 23. Table 21 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist G. The crosstabulations were by institution. The data indicated a great deal of stability across all institutions with an overall 64.1 percent average positive response.

TABLE 21

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST G BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	226	66.1	95	27.8	17	5.0	4	1.2	342	28.2
Pittsburgh	185	65.6	72	25.5	22	7.8	3	1.1	282	23.3
Temple	251	64.4	111	28.5	21	5.4	7	1.8	390	32.2
Indiana	110	59.1	60	32.3	14	7.5	2	1.1	186	15.3
Other	5	41.7	4	33.3	3	25.0	0	0.0	12	1.0
TOTAL	777	64.1	342	28.2	77	6.4	16	1.3	1,212	100.0

In Table 22 a similar response pattern was noted by the crosstabulations of data by current employment. However, there were three current employment areas below 60 percent. The areas were supervisors with no positive percentages, vocational agriculture at 56.7 percent and business at 55.6 percent. These areas were relatively low in total number of responses at 6, 30 and 36, respectively.

TABLE 22

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST G BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES								TOTAL	
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.5
Coordinator	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	17	56.7	9	30.0	3	10.0	1	3.3	30	2.5
Trade and Industry	563	64.3	249	28.4	54	6.2	10	1.1	876	72.3
Home Economics	63	65.6	27	28.1	3	3.1	3	3.1	96	7.9
Industrial Arts	9	75.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	1	8.3	12	1.0
Health Occupations	62	68.9	21	23.3	6	6.7	1	1.1	90	7.4
Marketing	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.5
Business	20	55.6	10	27.8	6	16.7	0	0.0	36	3.0
Technical	36	60.0	19	31.7	5	8.3	0	0.0	60	5.0
TOTAL	777	64.1	342	28.2	77	6.4	16	1.3	1,212	100.0

In examining the responses to the individual items on Checklist G (Table 23), a much larger variation was evidenced. Item 3 [Do the recent changes in teacher certification (e.g., induction process, extra credits to qualify and maintain a teaching certificate, etc.) negate the need for an intern teacher program?] responses were 24.8 percent positive and 57.4 percent negative suggesting the new changes did not negate the need for an intern program. Also, item 5 responses were 27.7 percent positive and 68.8 percent negative indicating the transition from education to industry was not as difficult as might be verbalized.

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST G

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Learning Experiences Useful	187	92.6	8	4.0	7	3.5	0	0.0
2. Program of Sufficient Length	168	83.2	22	10.9	12	5.9	0	0.0
3. New Changes Negate Need for Internship	50	24.8	116	57.4	28	13.9	8	4.0
4. Competencies Toward Certificate	180	89.1	11	5.4	10	5.0	1	0.5
5. Industry to Education Difficult	56	27.7	139	68.8	5	2.5	2	1.0
6. Courses Master Intern Competencies	136	67.3	46	22.8	15	7.4	5	2.5

Question 8 - Was an economical system provided whereby beginning teachers, usually from business and industry, could meet the state's requirements for certification?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 24, 25 and 26. Table 24 showed the total number and percent of responses to the items on Checklist H. The crosstabulations were by institution. Responses to the whole area of tuition differential were much less conclusive than those of the other center activities. Most of the responses were in the 50 to 60 percent range across all institutions. There was also a much larger number of "Not Applicable" and/or "None" responses than noted on the other checklists.

TABLE 24

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST H BY INSTITUTION

Institution	RESPONSES									
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Penn State	238	60.1	140	35.4	11	2.8	7	1.8	396	26.9
Pittsburgh	245	61.9	123	31.1	16	4.0	12	3.0	396	26.9
Temple	254	56.4	166	36.9	25	5.6	5	1.1	450	30.6
Indiana	107	49.5	98	45.4	8	3.7	3	1.4	216	14.7
Other	6	50.0	3	25.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	12	0.8
TOTAL	850	57.8	530	36.1	61	4.1	29	2.0	1,470	100.0

In Table 25 a similar response pattern was exhibited in the crosstabulations by current employment; that is, most of the positive responses were in the 50 to 60 percent range with two exceptions. The 6 coordinator and 12 industrial arts responses were 83.3 and 75.0 percent positive, respectively. The low number of responses, however, made these percentages suspect.

TABLE 25

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON CHECKLIST H BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Current Employment	RESPONSES								TOTAL	
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Director/Principal	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	12	0.8
Supervisor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Coordinator	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.4
Guidance Counselor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor										
Vocational Agriculture	30	50.0	27	45.0	2	3.3	1	1.7	60	4.1
Trade and Industry	616	58.7	361	34.4	46	4.4	27	2.6	1,050	71.4
Home Economics	53	52.0	45	44.1	4	3.9	0	0.0	102	6.9
Industrial Arts	9	75.0	3	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	0.8
Health Occupations	57	59.4	35	36.5	4	4.2	0	0.0	96	6.5
Marketing	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.4
Business	18	50.0	16	44.4	2	5.6	0	0.0	36	2.4
Technical	52	57.8	35	38.9	2	2.2	1	1.1	90	6.1
TOTAL	850	57.8	530	36.1	61	4.1	29	2.0	1,470	100.0

In examining the responses to the individual items on Checklist H (Table 26), two exceptions were noted. Item 1 (Was the tuition differential a contributing factor in your becoming a vocational teacher?) was 16.3 percent positive and 69.4 percent negative. The large negative response was heartening if one subscribes to the noneconomical rewards of becoming a teacher. Item 4 (Were you aware that a tuition differential was in effect for vocational courses offered through certain universities?) was 26.5 percent positive and 72.7 percent negative indicating very little awareness of the tuition differential. The result was not unexpected since the differential was phased out a few years ago. Thus, the only respondents aware of the differential were those who started their certification program some years ago.

TABLE 26

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON CHECKLIST H

Item Variable	RESPONSES							
	Yes		No		Not Applicable		None	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Tuition Differential a Factor	40	16.3	170	69.4	34	13.9	1	0.4
2. Ex-Industry Personnel Get Differential	219	89.4	26	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Lack of Differential Hinder Personnel Development	166	67.8	68	27.8	10	4.1	1	0.4
4. Aware of Differential	65	26.5	178	72.7	2	0.8	0	0.0
5. Differential Necessary for Good Teachers	180	73.5	49	20.0	5	2.0	11	4.5
6. Differential Reinstated	180	73.5	39	15.9	10	4.1	16	6.5

Placement Activity

As noted earlier, the placement component at the centers was evaluated differently than the other fundable activities. Thus, the resulting data, although a part of this overall study, is reported separately from the other activities.

The tabulations for the placement results were based on responses to items on a postcard survey. The data was tabulated to determine how individuals found teaching jobs in vocational education.

Question 9 - Was a statewide placement system established to assist vocational educators in finding employment as teachers, supervisors or administrators?

The results relating to this question are presented in Tables 27, 28, 29 and 30. In Table 27 the data was crosstabulated by the type of school in which the respondent was employed. The data indicates 63.6 percent were employed in comprehensive high schools, 34.5 percent in area vocational-technical schools and 1.8 percent in intermediate units. The most common procedure for securing a teaching position was through a "Personal Acquaintance" (35.9%). The "Other" category was second at 25.0 percent. The regular "College Placement Service" and "Published Announcement" were the third and fourth most frequently cited procedures with 22.0 and 18.6 percent, respectively. The "Center Placement Service" was last at 0.5 percent with only one person citing its use.

TABLE 27

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO TEACHER PLACEMENT SURVEY BY TYPE OF SCHOOL (PRESENT EMPLOYER)

	SOURCE OF PLACEMENT									
	College Placement Service		Center Placement Service		Personal Acquaintance		Published Announcement		Other		TOTAL	
Type of School	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Intermediate Unit	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	4	1.8
Area Vocational-Technical School	2	2.6	0	0.0	32	42.1	24	31.6	18	23.7	76	34.5
Comprehensive High School	41	29.3	1	0.7	46	32.9	17	12.1	35	25.0	140	63.6
TOTAL	44	20.0	1	0.5	79	35.9	41	18.6	55	25.0	220	100.0

The data in terms of the subject being taught was presented in Table 28. The results showed agriculture (50.0%) and distributive education (66.7%) teachers were the highest users of the "College Placement Service"; however, the number of respondents in these two areas was small. The highest number of

responses came from trade and industry (61), home economics (57) and business education (50). All three subject groups had similar placement patterns in that most found employment through "Personal Acquaintance." Health teachers also found jobs through "Personal Acquaintance" (45.5%) and "Published Announcement" (45.5%). Only one respondent, a business education teacher, cited the "Center Placement Service" as helpful in securing employment.

TABLE 28

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO TEACHER PLACEMENT SURVEY BY SUBJECT TAUGHT

	SOURCE OF PLACEMENT											
	College Placement Service		Center Placement Service		Personal Acquaintance		Published Announcement		Other		TOTAL	
Subject Taught	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Agriculture	8	50.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	2	12.5	4	25.0	16	7.3
Business Ed.	16	32.0	1	2.0	16	32.0	7	14.0	10	20.0	50	22.7
Distributive Ed.	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	1.4
Health	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.1	11	5.0
Home Economics	5	8.8	0	0.0	23	40.4	12	21.1	17	29.8	57	25.9
Industrial Arts	6	40.0	0	0.0	5	33.3	1	6.7	3	20.0	15	6.8
Technical Ed.	3	42.9	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	3	42.9	7	3.2
Trade and Industry	4	6.6	0	0.0	27	44.3	14	23.0	16	26.2	61	27.7
TOTAL	44	20.0	1	0.5	79	35.9	41	18.6	55	25.0	220	100.0

The analysis of the data based on degree held by the respondent is presented in Table 29. The results show the only individuals who secured placement through the "College Placement Service" or "Center Placement Service" were those holding a bachelor's degree. Those with a master's degree secured employment equally through "Personal Acquaintance" and "Other" means, while a smaller number (2) indicated "Published Announcement" as the source. Individuals without a degree secured their employment through "Personal Acquaintance"

nearly twice as frequently as they did through "Published Announcement" and "Other" sources. No one responding to the survey indicated they held a doctorate.

TABLE 29

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO TEACHER PLACEMENT SURVEY BY DEGREE

	SOURCE OF PLACEMENT											
	College Placement Service		Center Placement Service		Personal Acquaintance		Published Announcement		Other		TOTAL	
Degree	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Master	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	42.9	2	14.3	6	42.9	14	6.4
Bachelor	44	29.3	1	0.7	45	30.0	24	16.0	36	24.0	150	68.2
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	28	50.0	15	26.8	13	23.2	56	25.5
TOTAL	44	20.0	1	0.5	79	35.9	41	18.6	55	25.0	220	100.0

The final distribution of the placement survey data was by the teaching certificate held by the respondent. The results are presented in Table 30. Instructional I certificate holders cited the College Placement Service" as the primary source for securing a position. None of the other types of certificate holders were so inclined to do so. These other certificate holders were fairly uniform in citing "Other" placement sources as helping them find employment. The only individual citing the "Center Placement Service" as helping him find employment held an Instructional I certificate.

A secondary analysis of the "Other" placement category added little to support the "Center Placement Service." The 55 respondents to the "Other" placement category were as follows: learned of vacancy from the administrator (16), telephone calls to the school (2), wrote letters (9), taught as a substitute

in the district (16), referred by a college advisor (6) and referred by a union (6).

TABLE 30

CROSSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSES TO TEACHER PLACEMENT SURVEY BY CERTIFICATION

	SOURCE OF PLACEMENT											
	College Placement Service		Center Placement Service		Personal Acquaintance		Published Announcement		Other		TOTAL	
Certification	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Permanent	5	20.8	0	0.0	10	41.7	1	4.2	8	33.3	24	10.9
Instructional I	36	35.6	1	1.0	27	26.7	15	14.9	22	21.8	101	45.9
Vocational Instructor II	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8	3.6
Vocational Instructor I	3	5.7	0	0.0	19	35.8	14	26.4	17	32.1	53	24.1
Vocational Intern	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	56.7	9	30.0	4	13.3	30	13.6
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	4	1.8
TOTAL	44	20.0	1	0.5	79	35.9	41	18.6	55	25.0	220	100.0

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following discussion is based on the results reported in Chapter III. In addition, the comments on each question (Appendix D) provide further evaluative insights into the fundable activities at the vocational personnel development centers. Therefore, each of the evaluative questions directed the discussion.

Question 1 - Were pedagogical and technical workshops provided for updating instructors in the various program areas of vocational education?

The data supported the conclusion that pedagogical and technical updating workshops were provided by the personnel development centers. The respondents were very positive about their experiences in the updating workshops.

There was some concern relative to whether technical updating was a university responsibility. The respondents were about evenly divided on this issue, many feeling that updating was an individual or local education agency responsibility. Another issue of concern was if the workshops actually improved the instructors' competency. The data shows slightly over one-half did not feel that their competence was enhanced by the workshop. However, it could be hypothesized that individual instructors may not have perceived a competence change when one actually took place in some intrinsic way.

Based on the comments in Checklist A, major concerns fall into four categories: (1) the relatively small number of programmatic offerings addressed by the workshops, (2) the timing of some of the workshops; for example, summer, when many instructors work at their trade, (3) instructors felt they did not have much input in deciding what workshops would be offered and (4) infrequency of workshops.

Question 2 - Were conventional off-campus courses provided for preservice and in-service vocational educators who were not served through a field-based, competency based teacher education and leadership program?

The data supports the conclusion that conventional off-campus courses were provided by the personnel development centers. All respondents were quite positive regarding the off-campus offerings.

One area of concern was that the cycle of courses was not repeated often enough to satisfy the timetables of some of the instructors seeking college degrees. Some students had to substitute courses for ones not available when needed.

Another significant concern reflected in the data was that most respondents preferred all their course work be through outreach courses. While the idea may have some merit, it seems impractical and ill advised to implement an off-campus program. However, some modifications in the present system may help to eliminate comments such as "My inability to locate classes nearby may mean the difference between my remaining in teaching or returning to my previous

employment." or "Some of the courses were offered at the most inconvenient hours--an hour's drive in good weather was impossible in winter."

Question 3 - Were pedagogical competencies provided to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified?

The data supports the conclusion that pedagogical competencies were provided to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified. The respondents were nearly unanimous in their support for this center activity.

The only area of concern was the availability of the full range of services provided to students in more conventional teacher preparation programs. The responses were about evenly divided on the concern with slightly more indicating a lack of the full range of university services. The reaction was predictable since the competencies were offered through a field-based program. Thus, with the exception of periodic on-campus meetings the opportunity to use many of the university services was limited. However, it did appear that a fairly large number of respondents were able to avail themselves of the university services.

Question 4 - Were competency-based internships provided for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors of vocational education and for those students developing curriculum specialist competencies?

The data supports the conclusion that leadership, supervisory and curriculum development competencies were provided for those aspiring to be vocational education directors, supervisors and curriculum specialists. The responses were quite positive regarding this center activity. Coordinators and business

education teachers were the only two groups that were below a two-thirds positive response rate.

There did not seem to be any particular major area of concern among the respondents. One area with somewhat lower positive responses was the cost-effectiveness of the program. Some respondents indicated they could not make a comparison with the campus-based program because the cost of the latter program was unknown to them. The other area of minor concern was whether the university helped in securing an internship. Obviously, many of the internships were secured by or with the assistance of the university; but approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated securing their internship by other means. It seems a number of the latter group were already employed by the institution where they served the internship. It may be in such cases the university's role is to make sure the internship is worthwhile for the intern as well as the institution.

Question 5 - Were competency-based programs provided for teaching the necessary instructor competencies for establishing and operating vocational student organizations?

The data supported the conclusion that competencies for establishing and operating student organizations were provided through the centers. The responses were very positive toward this center activity with nearly a two-thirds positive response overall. Industrial arts and business education instructors responded less favorably than the other instructors, perhaps because it was a part of their undergraduate requirements.

There did not appear to be any major areas of concern reflected in the data from the individual checklist items. The comments taken from Checklist E are also supportive of the activity. Examples include: (1) "Every teacher that has no skills to organize youth groups should have this instruction." (2) "A person from industry is not necessarily familiar with the vocational student organizations." (3) "An elective, but I feel everyone should take this course."

Question 6 - Was assistance provided to beginning teachers including persons with baccalaureate degrees in solving a wide range of professional problems?

The data supports the conclusion that assistance was provided to beginning teachers in solving a wide range of professional problems. Nearly three-fourths of all responses were positive.

In Checklist F the only nonconforming item dealt with whether the respondent had his/her baccalaureate degree before participating in the program. Less that one-fourth reported having a degree before participating in the program. The responses could be interpreted as an indication of the primary personnel development thrust of the centers; that is, the preparation of skilled individuals from business and industry to become qualified vocational-technical instructors. To this end, holding a degree was not a prerequisite for entering the program or beginning to teach. Thus, the data seems to reflect that the individuals for whom the system was designed were the ones being served.

Question 7 - Was assistance provided to prospective teachers in making the difficult transition from industry to the vocational classroom/laboratory?

The data supports the conclusion that assistance was provided to prospective teachers making the transition from industry to the vocational classroom/ laboratory. Overall, nearly two-thirds of the responses were positive. The responses from the noncenter schools were lower as expected because transforming skilled individuals into vocational-technical instructors was not their primary goal. A similar situation existed with the current employment data. Vocational agriculture and business education instructors reported lower percentages on the transition question because most of them came through the degree route. Thus, any transition services were built into their preparation program including student teaching.

In Checklist G two areas of concern provided the opportunity for discussion. First, "Do the recent changes in teacher certification (e.g., induction process, extra credits to qualify and maintain a teaching certificate, etc.) negate the need for an intern program?" Slightly over half of the responses were negative indicating that the new regulations did not negate the need for the intern program, while one-fourth indicated the program was no longer needed. However, another set of responses of note were the nonapplicables. These responses indicated either a lack of knowledge about the intern program or its relationship to the new teacher preparation regulations. A review of the comments on the item provided very little assistance in interpreting the responses in that it was a 50/50 split on the issue.

The second concern, "Was the transition from industry to the vocational classroom a difficult one for you?" Nearly three-fourths of the responses were negative indicating very little difficulty in making the transition to education from industry. If the intent of the internship was to help ease the transition,

an inconsistency existed between the perceptions of those providing the service and those receiving them. It would appear that many of the respondents did not perceive a transitional problem when they moved into a teaching position. However, upon reviewing the comments for the item it appeared that many individuals went through some kind of intermediate step before entering the vocational classroom; for example, private sector teaching, instructing employees in self-owned business or trade school experience. Thus, one could speculate that the perception of no transitional problems may be understated due to the prior experience of some of the individuals entering vocational classrooms. It appeared that some intermediary experience was necessary for successful teaching in vocational-technical classrooms/laboratories.

Question 8 - Was an economical system provided whereby beginning teachers, usually from business and industry, could meet the state's requirements for certification?

The data supports the conclusion that an economical system, via a tuition differential, existed for some instructors who entered preparation programs some years ago. However, there was little awareness of any differential during the past several years. The latter was true because the tuition differential was phased out several years ago.

The lack of awareness of the tuition differential and the concurrent large number of respondents indicates that the responses are a reflection of how the respondents felt about reinstatement of a tuition differential or other financial incentives for beginning teachers.

This concern was evident from the responses to individual items in Checklist H. Over two-thirds of the responses to item 1 showed little effect of the tuition differential as a contributing factor in becoming a vocational teacher. Conversely, the positive responses were nearly unanimous in reference to item 2--"Do you believe individuals leaving industry to become vocational teachers should receive a tuition differential for their course work?" The comments only fortify the responses to the question. For example: (1) "I was financially exhausted after paying the full cost of tuition on a beginning teacher's salary." (2) "It would be the best way to lure quality people into our vocational system." (3) "Most industries pay a part of further education."

One must ask the question, "Are these responses motivated by individual self-serving motives or a true concern for quality in the teaching profession?" Speculatively, the data and comments support the latter in that responses to the other questions on the checklist reflect a genuine interest in assuring quality in the teaching profession.

Placement Activity

Since the placement activity was evaluated differently than the other activities, discussion about it will be treated separately.

Question 9 - Was a statewide placement system established to assist vocational educators in finding employment as teachers, supervisors or administrators?

The data is not favorable on this question. Only one out of several hundred respondents indicated using the service to find employment. That employee was a business education instructor at a comprehensive high school--not the primary clientele that prompted the establishment of the service. As with most prior studies of placement, most employees found employment through personal acquaintances.

Even if one credits the center placement services with several of the "Other" placement subcategories, percentages do not improve appreciably. The old adages of "being in the right place at the right time" and "knowing the right people" still seem to apply.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions and supporting data in this study the following recommendations are made:

1. Technical updating of vocational instructors has been sporadic, limited in scope, participated in by a relatively small number of instructors (compared to those in need of updating), ill timed and fiscally inefficient. Therefore, it is recommended that alternative strategies for updating vocational teachers be developed and implemented to provide an ongoing system where individuals can maintain and improve the quality of instruction being offered in the Commonwealth's classrooms and laboratories.

2. Conventional off-campus courses continue to be a significant component of the vocational teacher preparation program at the centers. For many vocational educators these courses provide the best means of securing credits for certification and/or university degrees. This system, however, is not without drawbacks such as timing and location of the offerings. Therefore, it is recommended that the off-campus offerings be continued but with modifications as determined by a thorough review of the program. The review should establish how the program can provide the greatest benefit to those needing the service.

3. Although study results do not confirm it, some individuals find the transition from industry to the classroom difficult. It is recommended, therefore, that the entire area of transitional services be reviewed and appropriately addressed if the need is real. Any review must include the provisions incorporated in the recently revised Chapter 49 regulations.

4. Although the tuition differential was phased out several years ago and most of the respondents could not avail themselves of the benefits, it is clear that many prospective vocational teachers never enter the profession because of financial considerations. These financial concerns arise because of the educational requirements that must be met (and paid) in order to become certified to teach. Individuals wanting to enter teaching cannot justify taking a lower salary and committing to the payment of required credits. Therefore, it is recommended that some form of financial assistance be provided to individuals from industry for the minimum credits required to

become certified to teacher but not in addition to aid provided by an employing institution.

5. Although it is not clear why the statewide placement service for vocational educators never materialized as projected in the implementation proposal, lack of centers' commitment, incompatible equipment, "turf" issues, duplication with existing services and lack of participation by local education agencies all seem to be contributing factors. It is recommended, therefore, that the placement activity be eliminated as a fundable component of the centers' programs of work. Resources devoted to placement service activities should be redirected to more viable endeavors.

REFERENCES

Adamsky, R.A. "An Assessment of Temple's Field-Based, Competency-Based System to Prepare Vocational Teachers." Department of Vocational Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, 1981.

Columbia Broadcasting System. "Is Anyone Out There Listening?" New York: Columbia Broadcasting System, August 23, 1978.

Gallup, G.H. "The Thirteenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 1, September 1983, p. 35.

Swatt, K. "A Position Paper on the Funding of Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs in Pennsylvania." Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA, 1977.

APPENDIX A

Dear Colleague:

The Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education in the Pennsylvania Department of Education is presently conducting a study of vocational teacher preparation. One phase of the study involves determining how prospective vocational teachers locate teaching positions. You have been identified as a recently hired instructor (within the last three years).

Your prompt completion and return of the attached postcard will greatly aid us in our efforts. All responses will be held in strictest confidence and only summary data will be published.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Clarence A. Dittenhafer
Research Associate
Division of VOED Planning and
Research Services
Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education

TEACHER EDUCATION SURVEY

Present Employer _____ College Attended _____

Subject Taught _____ Years Teaching Experience _____

Do you have: ___Bachelor's ___Master's ___Doctorate

Type of Teaching Certificate: ___Vocational Intern ___Vocational Instructional I

___Vocational Instructional II ___Instructional I ___Permanent

What was your occupation immediately before taking your present teaching assignment?

_____

Did you have to relocate to accept your present position? ___Yes ___No

If yes, how far (miles)? ___

How did you learn about the teaching vacancy?

___College or University Placement Service
___Vocational Personnel Development Center Placement Service
___Personal Acquaintance
___Published Announcement
___Other (Specify) _____

PDE-4313 (3/85)

APPENDIX B

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
333 MARKET STREET
HARRISBURG, PA 17126-0333

February 14, 1986

Dear Colleague:

The attached questionnaire will give you the opportunity to provide the Pennsylvania Department of Education with feedback relative to your preparation for teaching. The content of the questionnaire relates to the vocational teacher preparation services provided through the centers at The Pennsylvania State University, University of Pittsburgh, Temple University and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Many of you have graduated from these universities and/or participated in the services provided through the four centers.

You will note the questionnaire is divided into two parts. Part I is background information about yourself and should be completed by you whether or not you have participated in any of the centers' services. Part II describes each of the eight fundable center services. Review the descriptions and for each service in which you have participated complete the short six-item questionnaire. Feel free to make any comment about specific items on the checklist or, in general, about your overall vocational teacher preparation program. If you have not participated in any of the described services, please complete only Part I of the questionnaire. Return the completed questionnaire by March 14, 1986 to:

Clarence A. Dittenhafer
Research Associate
Vocational Research and Data Management Services
Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Thank you in advance for your interest in improving vocational teacher preparation in Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

Clarence A. Dittenhafer

Clarence A. Dittenhafer
Research Associate
Vocational Research and Data
Management Services
Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education

CAD/dlr

Attachment

QUESTIONNAIRE TO DISCOVER THE PERCEPTIONS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS TOWARD TEACHER PREPARATION

Part I: Background Information: Answer these background questions by checking the most appropriate response for your situation.

1. Check the title that best describes your current employment.

_____ Director/Principal
_____ Assistant Administrator
_____ Supervisor
_____ Coordinator
_____ Guidance Counselor
Instructor:
_____ Vocational Agriculture
_____ Trade and Industry
_____ Home Economics
_____ Industrial Arts
_____ Health Occupations
_____ Marketing & Distribution
_____ Business Education
_____ Technical

2. Check the "years of experience" you have accrued in all positions in vocational education.

_____ 0 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ Over 15 years

3. How recently have you participated in a vocational teacher preparation program?

a. Vocational Studies

_____ 0 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ Over 15 years

b. General Studies

_____ 0 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ Over 15 years

4. Check the university from which you graduated and/or participated in courses designed to meet the various vocational certifications.

_____ Pennsylvania State University
_____ University of Pittsburgh
_____ Temple University
_____ Indiana University of Pennsylvania
_____ Other, Specify _____
_____

Part II: University Services

Four vocational teacher education centers were established in the late 1970s at The Pennsylvania State University, University of Pittsburgh, Temple University and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The purpose of these centers was to expedite the preparation of needed vocational teachers and administrators. A significant portion of the centers' funding came from federal vocational sources. These funds were to be directed toward specific activities above and beyond those normally associated with teacher preparation. The federal funds for the activities were obtained via contracts with the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Many of you may have participated in one or more of these activities. The eight fundable activities are described on the following pages. Each description is followed by a six-item checklist. For those activities that you have participated in, please complete the accompanying checklist by checking an appropriate response for each of the six items.

CHECKLIST A

Activity: "To provide pedagogical and technical workshops for updating instructors in the various service areas of vocational education."

These workshops were offered or coordinated by the four vocational teacher preparation centers after determining the needs and interests of vocational educators. The intent of the workshops was to help currently employed vocational educators improve their teaching methods, administrative abilities and technical skills updating. Where practical the workshops were developed in conjunction with industry. There usually was no fee charged for the workshops and attendance was voluntary.

1. Did the technical updating workshops provide hands-on experiences where new equipment or processes were involved?
   Comments:

   Yes _____
   No _____
   NA _____

2. Was updating your teaching methods and technical skills a university responsibility?
   Comments:

   Yes _____
   No _____
   NA _____

3. Were the skills you received in the updating workshop usable in your instructional program?
   Comments:

   Yes _____
   No _____
   NA _____

4. Were the workshops helpful in updating your occupational competence?
   Comments:

   Yes _____
   No _____
   NA _____

5. Were you given the opportunity to help determine what workshops would be offered?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

6. Were you generally satisfied with the workshops as a way to update your competence?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

CHECKLIST B

Activity: "To provide conventional off-campus courses for preservice and in-service vocational educators who cannot be served through a field-based, competency-based teacher education and leadership program."

These courses were usually offered in the evenings or on Saturdays. The off-campus procedure eliminated the need for students to travel to main campuses in order to meet teacher preparation requirements. The courses were normally taught by university staff or itinerant personnel using a large group lecture/discussion format.

1. Were the off-campus courses offered within easy commuting distance for you? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Were the off-campus courses repeated often enough to meet your personal needs relative to certification and/or degree requirements? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Were the off-campus courses normally taught by full-time university staff? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Did the off-campus courses hamper communications between you and on-campus university staff? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Were the necessary resources (e.g., a library) available to complete the off-campus courses? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

6. Would you prefer that all vocational teacher preparation be offered through off-campus courses?
Comments:

Yes ____
No ____
NA ____

CHECKLIST C

Activity: "To provide pedagogical competencies to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified. The program provides for individualized training through the use of nationally developed modules. The modules are completed by the teacher concurrently with his/her teaching assignment."

The activity was accomplished through an individualized program for each prospective teacher. The method was opposite to the conventional large group lecture/discussion format used in most university classrooms and off-campus courses. The other unique feature was the use of resident resource persons as well as university field staff for individual assistance and evaluation of competence.

1. Did the field-based preparation program provide a definitive plan for completing your certification requirements? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Were the teacher training modules a valuable tool in enabling you to accomplish the needed competencies? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Did the field-based program provide for interaction with other vocational teachers at the same level of professional preparation? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Did the field-based program provide for your understanding of educational issues or problems in teaching? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Did the field-based program provide for adequate interaction between you and the university staff?

Yes ____
No ____
NA ____

Comments:

6. Did the field-based program enable you to utilize the full range of university services normally provided to students in more conventional teacher preparation programs?

Yes ____
No ____
NA ____

Comments:

CHECKLIST D

Activity: "To provide a competency-based internship for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors of vocational education and for students developing curriculum specialist competencies. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity utilized the individualized approach and included the use of nationally developed leadership modules. University support services included weekly meetings with field resource persons and periodic visits by the program's coordinator. Daily on-the-job assistance was provided by a resident leadership resource person in each participant's respective school.

1. Did the field-based leadership program provide you with an internship consistent with your professional preparation program? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Did the field-based leadership program provide a planned set of competencies to be achieved during the internship experience? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Was the field-based leadership program less costly to you than a conventional campus-based program would have been? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Did the field resource and resident leadership persons provide the necessary reinforcement and information to help you achieve success in the program? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Did your internship provide you with the opportunity to apply theoretical principles in practical situations?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

6. Was the university instrumental in helping you secure a suitable internship?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

CHECKLIST E

Activity: "To provide a competency-based program for teaching the necessary instructor competencies for establishing and operating vocational student organizations. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity used the field-based approach to provide instructors with the necessary competencies for helping students to work within organizations as well as organize and operate them. The training approach used both simulation and application in the classroom to bring instructors to the desired competence.

1. Did the field-based program provide you with the competencies necessary to organize and operate a vocational student organization? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Would an in-service workshop be as effective as the field-based approach in providing the vocational student organization competencies? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Was the mastery of competencies in organizing and operating vocational student organizations required for the completion of your teacher preparation program? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Was formal instruction in organizing and operating a vocational student organization really necessary? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Do you presently advise a vocational student organization? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

Comments:

6. Do you feel competence in organizing and operating vocational student organizations should be a requirement in teacher preparation programs? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

Comments:

CHECKLIST F

Activity: "To provide assistance to beginning teachers including persons with baccalaureate degrees in solving a wide variety of professional problems. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity was designed to help first-year vocational teachers in comprehensive high schools. The program operated in local schools and involved field resource persons working with the new teacher through the use of nationally developed modules. The modules selected for completion by the new teacher were based on individual needs assessments. Each individual was cycled through the identified modules until all were completed.

1. Did university field staff assist you in selecting the teacher preparation modules? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Were the modules relevant to your professional needs? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Did you receive your baccalaureate degree before participating in the program? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Did resource personnel provide continual support as you proceeded through the selected modules? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Did you complete all the modules identified to meet your professional needs? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

6. Did the evaluative procedures in the program provide an effective feedback mechanism in helping you complete the program?

Yes ____
No ____
NA ____

Comments:

CHECKLIST G

Activity: "To provide assistance to prospective vocational teachers in making the difficult transition from industry to the vocational classroom/laboratory."

The activity was designed to get participants involved in learning experiences that were identified as being essential in the first few weeks of teaching. An added benefit of the program was the direct articulation with the vocational instructional certificate program. Thus, the accomplished skills were applied toward the teaching certificate.

1. Were the learning activities you experienced as an intern useful to you as a vocational teacher? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Was the intern program of sufficient length for you to master the essential teaching skills? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Do the recent changes in teacher certification (e.g., induction process, extra credits to qualify and maintain a teaching certificate, etc.) negate the need for an intern teacher program? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Were the competencies mastered in your internship applied toward your vocational instruction certificate? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Was the transition from industry to the vocational classroom a difficult one for you? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

6. Would courses in teaching methods enable you to master the competencies provided in the intern program?

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

Comments:

CHECKLIST H

Activity: "To provide an economical system whereby beginning teachers, usually from business and industry, could meet the state's requirements for certification (tuition differential)."

The activity was really a fiscal one whereby teacher education courses labeled "vocational" were subsidized with federal monies resulting in substantially lower tuition for the student. The intent of the reduced tuition was to entice business and industry personnel into vocational teaching by helping them meet the costs of teacher preparation required for certification.

1. Was the tuition differential a contributing factor in your becoming a vocational teacher? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

2. Do you believe individuals leaving industry to become vocational teachers should receive a tuition differential for their course work? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

3. Does the lack of a current tuition differential deter vocational teachers from continuing their professional growth through university-sponsored courses? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

4. Were you aware that a tuition differential was in effect for vocational courses offered through certain universities? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____
   Comments:

5. Do you believe a tuition differential is necessary to maintain an adequate supply of vocational teachers?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

6. Should a tuition differential be reinstituted at the four vocational teacher preparation centers on a restricted basis?
Comments:

Yes _____
No _____
NA _____

APPENDIX C

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS FROM WHICH RESPONDENTS GRADUATED AND/OR PARTICIPATED IN COURSES DESIGNED TO MEET THE VARIOUS VOCATIONAL CERTIFICATIONS

Albright College
Bloomsburg University of PA
Bucks County Community College
Buffalo State University (NY)
California State University (CA)
California University of PA
Cheyney University of PA
Clarion University of PA
College Misericordia
Community College of Allegheny County
Corpus Christi State University (TX)
Culinary Institute of America (NY)
Davis and Elkins College (WV)
Drexel University
East Stroudsburg University of PA
Edinboro University of PA
Fairmont State College (WV)
Holy Family College
Hunter College (NY)
Illinois Institute of Technology (IL)
Indiana University of PA
Jersey City State College (NJ)
LaSalle University
Lebanon Valley College
Lehigh University
Luzerne County Community College
Mansfield University of PA
Marywood College
Millersville University of PA
Montgomery County Community College
Northampton County Area Community College
Otterbein College (OH)
Pennsylvania State University
Pratt Institute (NY)
Purdue University (IN)
Seton Hill College
Shippensburg University of PA
Slippery Rock University of PA
Susquehanna University
Syracuse University (NY)
Temple University
Thiel College
University of Delaware (DE)
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Southern Maine (ME)
University of Toledo (OH)
Villa Maria College
Villanova University
West Chester University of PA
Westmoreland County Community College
Wilkes College
York College of PA

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS

The following comments were taken from the surveys completed by the respondents. The purpose of the comments was to provide the opportunity for respondents to supply additional information about their response to each question. The comments thereby assisted the researcher in gaining a greater insight into the individual responses. The comments also serve to help the reader identify the varied concerns vocational teachers have about their professional training.

The comments are divided into two basic groupings. The first grouping entitled "General" contains statements about the overall effectiveness of the preparation program. The second grouping contains comments relating to each of the six questions on the eight checklists. While not everyone had comments, a sizable number of respondents did express views about their involvement in particular activities.

The statements, for the most part, are taken intact from the surveys with very little editorializing by the researcher. Some of the statements are open to interpretation, but most are straightforward and require little, if any, additional information.

GENERAL

- All vocational education teachers should be required to complete a baccalaureate degree program before entering the classroom.

- The NOCTI tests for certification in electronics are unbelievably complex (180 questions in three hours covering every sector of electronics). It was like taking a three-hour examination of every course ever taken in college. It is no wonder you cannot attract tradesmen into vocational teacher education.

- Program should be aligned more toward competency-based instructional techniques with much less emphasis on lecture.

- The video equipment that I was required to work with was antiquated, annoying, frustrating, time consuming and not worth the effort. Time and again the equipment did not function properly after spending much time setting it up.

- My personal feeling is that there must be an incentive to leave industry and become a vocational education instructor. The incentives could be:
  (a) More salary credit for trade experience; i.e., a consistent pay ladder, perhaps one salary step for each year of trade experience that would be accepted by all districts.
  (b) A larger initial salary for minimum career experience.
  (c) A reevaluation of mandatory courses assigned by the university. Give credit for "Life Skills" obtained and acquired through industry and business.

- I am already certified under an Instructional I certificate and hold a master's degree in mathematics education. I feel that requiring me to complete 30 credits in vocational education was unnecessary. What is needed is an effective, efficient means of cross-training academic teachers for vocational education. Basically, the teaching concepts are the same in academic and vocational education. All that is needed is a change in methods and focus.

- I am a certified mechanic qualified to teach at private, postsecondary vocational-technical schools such as Rosedale or Vale. Why does the State of Pennsylvania require me to continue to take meaningless courses at the university to teach high school courses?

- I would suggest a three- or four-credit course covering overviews of education, history, future trends, etc., taught by very knowledgeable persons to tie together the field-based program. Courses of this type are not presently a part of the field-based program.

- I am vocational in background and feel I missed the course work that a typical academic teacher receives. I think the future of vocational education lies in more academic/technical classroom work. The present system tends to aid the new instructor in achieving certification without receiving certain overviews of all types of education.

- I was not aware that the majority of the activities cited in the survey were available.

- I really do wish something could be done to make it easier for vocational teachers to obtain their required credits. I enjoy teaching and am willing to go nearby

for classes but not the distance I've gone in the past. My inability to locate classes nearby may mean the difference between my remaining in teaching or returning to my previous employment.

- I asked about a program to replace the field-based CBTE since my needs were not being met. The university's reply was that they offered courses on main campus and I am welcome to drive in and take them.

- I strongly believe that three major problems exist in the field-based CBTE program. They are:
  1. Using academic (no vocational experience) personnel as field resource persons.
  2. High turnover rate of field resource persons. This causes inconsistency in the program.
  3. No interaction among interns. Thirty modules and one general course are required for the Vocational I certificate, and the only interaction was during the general course and small group meetings. During the meetings, problems were not discussed. If less modules and more methods/courses were required earlier in the certification process, the intern would gain more information faster. This would be accomplished by having more contact with the instructor of the course than the five-to-15 minutes a week I received from the field resource person. The additional interaction between the students enrolled in the class would be very beneficial.

- At one time, courses were offered to vocational education teachers at the rate of $25 per semester hour. The cost of those same courses today is $110 per semester hour. Costs are too high. If the "restriction(s)" are not too stringent, it could help attract individuals into the profession. I know teachers who went to the master's-plus-30-credits level for less cost than I had to pay for 30 semester hours.

- The program (internship for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors) is so difficult for a full-time teacher to conscientiously complete, most interns must compromise their ethics or their professionalism or both to successfully complete certification. Once a person compromises his or her integrity it becomes easier to be less and less authentic. Consequently, the program reinforces all the attributes of weak leadership! Vocational education is in a very weak position in Pennsylvania specifically and in education generally because we are puppets of the sending school districts. We are puppets because of the weak leaders we have produced and promoted.

- Those who want to commit their life to teaching will pursue a college education and complete the state's certification standards. Those who really aren't committed to the education of our youth will not prepare themselves properly for the classroom--they, instead, seek shortcuts (in-service credit, life experience credit, etc.) and pay (cash "lures") above all others. In my observation, the "teachers" who left industry to "give" to education were, in most cases, dead weight to industry. They couldn't make it in industry, so they slither into the education field--we don't need this caliber of educator.

CHECKLIST A

Activity: "To provide pedagogical and technical workshops for updating instructors in the various service areas of vocational education."

These workshops were offered or coordinated by the four vocational teacher preparation centers after determining the needs and interests of vocational educators. The intent of the workshops was to help currently employed vocational educators improve their teaching methods, administrative abilities and technical skills updating. Where practical the workshops were developed in conjunction with industry. There usually was no fee charged for the workshops and attendance was voluntary.

1. Did the technical updating workshops provide hands-on experiences where new equipment or processes were involved?

   - Some workshops are not planned to provide hands-on experiences.
   - None offered for my instructional area (Commercial Art).
   - None offered for my instructional area (Quantity Foods).
   - Masonry instructors requested a hands-on tile setting workshop in the fall of 1984. One was scheduled for the summer of 1985, but most masonry teachers work at the trade in the summer and attendance was poor.
   - It was a worthwhile workshop as it included state-of-the-art technology.
   - IUP has never offered technical updating workshops to persons enrolled in the PBTE program.
   - I have never been offered a technical updating workshop.
   - Very limited hands-on experiences.
   - No hands-on experiences in the welding area.
   - I had no knowledge of these in the last five years.
   - Elliott Company through Indiana University provided a welding workshop in an actual shop setting.
   - Informative, various teaching methods explored.
   - Some were not up to date.
   - The school board did not approve of the program.
   - It made me aware of the vocational co-op laws and procedures.
   - The workshop gave me the opportunity to see new equipment and processes in operation.

2. Was updating your teaching methods and technical skills a university responsibility?

   - Teaching methods only.
   - Temple classes gave me a lot of ideas, but trial and error in the classroom provided the final test of the methodologies.
   - It is one's personal responsibility.
   - It is a shared responsibility. The university and PDE schedule the opportunities and the LEA administrators assure attendance.
   - I feel this is an administrative responsibility at each school.
   - Our school had its own workshop.
   - It was the university's responsibility to provide, but mine to attend.
   - A personal responsibility, sometimes handled through "In-Service" in the school where employed.
   - I believe they are an asset and may be mandated in the future.
   - I feel the workshop could have been much better.
   - The university helps the teacher to the point of the Vocational I certificate. The instructor must often update his/her teaching methods on his/her own.
   - It is the responsibility of the teacher not the university.
   - I am not really sure!
   - Providing students with the ability to teach was one of the university's objectives.
   - I was told that Temple was supposed to do this, but I have not seen it happen.
   - When I asked permission to take a course in a new area within my field, Temple's response was that I could take it but could not use it as my elective. In other words, it would not count toward certification.
   - Their up-to-date information made the course more meaningful.
   - The university's responsibility is to provide the opportunity.

3. Were the skills you received in the updating workshop usable in your instructional program?

   - Very good.
   - Updating is needed on a yearly basis.
   - Competency-based lesson planning phase.

- Partially.
- Equipment is being purchased for the instruction of future students.
- The updates related directly to the curriculum.
- Only a workshop on special needs provided any relevant information. All others I attended pertained to certification requirements or changes therein.
- I am not in a coordination position, but I feel qualified to do the job because of what I learned in the course.

4. Were the workshops helpful in updating your occupational competence?

- Need more for electronics.
- Updated my teaching skills.
- Correct lesson planning/course planning.
- Competency matrix for my trade area.
- Yes, especially in the area of certification competence.
- Minimal help, but this was probably due to the size of the workshop.
- I had prior experience in this area.
- I was not aware that any such workshop existed.
- I work at my trade to update myself. I also read everything I get my hands on.
- The instructor must prepare for the occupational competency test. I have found the workshops a waste of my time due to the presenters' lack of experience.
- Although most of the skills I already knew from past experience. I was more encouraged to incorporate the skills into my program.
- Need other instructors in one's specific trade area to exchange ideas.
- Yes, from an information viewpoint the new advances in auto mechanics were essential.
- How can somebody teach me how to cook when they have never done it themselves!
- It made me more aware of the legal aspects of placing young people on the job.

5. Were you given the opportunity to help determine what workshops would be offered?

- Summer workshops are poorly attended because many instructors have a second job.

- Very good--offered too early in morning.
- Through a comment sheet.
- At times we were asked for recommendations.
- I would like some input.
- Not that I was aware of.
- I believe a questionnaire was given to me for completion.
- I was able to talk to the people in charge and give my input on what should or would be helpful workshops.
- Yes, but only through our field resource person who had not been with the program very long.
- The workshop was offered at our request because we had enough interest.

6. Were you generally satisfied with the workshops as a way to update your competence?

- I believe the workshop was too narrow in scope.
- The powermatic workshop was the only one I knew about. I would have attended more if I knew about them.
- I thought they should have been more accessible geographically.
- More could be offered at a variety of locations.
- One-day workshops are usually of very little value, especially for hands-on experience.
- They have offered only two in the seven years that I've been teaching.
- They could have been more intense with guidelines relative to lesson plans, course placement, tests, quizzes and related information.
- Only got a few specific methods to be used theoretically.
- I do not believe the presenters addressed the needs of the instructors. Many of the presenters (university personnel) were not acquainted with the trade areas.
- The workshops were excellent. I attended home economics updating and curriculum workshops in Harrisburg and a parenting workshop in Reading.
- Some had nothing to do with any competencies.
- I haven't seen very many offerings.
- Very informative and interesting.
- The workshops gave me the opportunity to discuss the requirements of industry for beginning workers. I also observed and learned about new equipment and processes.

CHECKLIST B

Activity: "To provide conventional off-campus courses for preservice and in-service vocational educators who cannot be served through a field-based, competency-based teacher education and leadership program."

These courses were usually offered in the evenings or on Saturdays. The off-campus procedure eliminated the need for students to travel to main campuses in order to meet teacher preparation requirements. The courses were normally taught by university staff or itinerant personnel using a large group lecture/discussion format.

1. Were the off-campus courses offered within easy commuting distance for you?

- Too far away.
- Some of the courses were offered at the most inconvenient hours--an hour's drive in good weather was impossible in winter.
- If you call 50 miles easy--I did it!
- I didn't attend this past semester because of the four-hour round trip to Mercer.
- No general education courses are offered through Pitt in this area.
- I traveled 146 miles round trip.
- I now attend Mathematics 101 in Mercer. The class ends at 10:00 p.m. and I get home at midnight.
- I had to travel 30 miles.
- DuBois to Mercer.
- Within 50 miles.
- This was the most difficult problem. Precious time was spent traveling and tired teachers were the result.
- Yes for some classes, others were farther away.
- I live in an area from which it is almost impossible to travel to Penn State for classes. I wish we could be provided with more off-campus courses.
- While courses were required, there was little option as to days or times. It was not unusual to leave school and go to class returning home after 10:00 p.m. Even though off-campus courses required travel, on-campus courses would have been worse.
- Right in the school, after the day students left, which meant we did not have to return for evening classes.
- They usually are offered 50 to 70 miles from my home.

2. Were the off-campus courses repeated often enough to meet your personal needs relative to certification and/or degree requirements?

   - Took courses as they were offered to meet certification requirements.
   - Temple University will not send instructors for off-campus courses even when there is adequate enrollment.
   - Well planned.
   - Some classes were irrelevant to vocational teaching.
   - I've waited three years for Mathematics 101. There are other required courses that have never been offered. Time is running out!
   - A professional course I needed very badly was never offered. I took it upon myself to make personal arrangements with Clarion University in order to fulfill the certification requirement.
   - Commuting distances are too far.
   - Only once in spring for two consecutive Saturdays.
   - I'm at a point where I'm having to search out courses to complete my certification requirements. I am not willing to drive two to three hours in one direction to get them.
   - Yes, in the five years I've been teaching.
   - It seemed to depend upon the interest and need of the teachers in a geographic area.

3. Were the off-campus courses normally taught by full-time university staff?

   - Courses taught by part-time staff who understood vocational education.
   - My off-campus instructors were very qualified. Some better than the on-campus ones.
   - The ones I have taken so far.
   - Very competent and were available by telephone at all times.
   - Don't really know.
   - Unknown.
   - Speech wasn't. I don't know about the others.
   - A team of four.
   - Some of them.

4. Did the off-campus courses hamper communications between you and on-campus university staff?

   - Only had one large group meeting.
   - Very much so--no system at all.
   - We have no communications with university staff. The center needs a complete overhaul administratively.
   - There were no intentional problems, but records were difficult to coordinate.
   - I felt I was only a telephone call away from the expertise if deemed necessary.
   - It was difficult to obtain information and guidance. Most of the off-campus students are unfamiliar with vocational requirements.

5. Were the necessary resources (e.g., a library) available to complete the off-campus courses?

   - Local library was sufficient.
   - Most courses required reverting back to the main campus library.
   - Not practical.
   - Except in a few rare circumstances.
   - The necessary books and materials were provided.
   - All the materials for the course were brought by the instructor.

6. Would you prefer that all vocational teacher preparation be offered through off-campus courses?

   - Off-campus courses are extremely helpful because they provide for the interaction between fellow vocational educators.
   - Most instructors are understanding during evening courses, and intelligent discussion was more relevant.
   - Off-campus courses are better than CBTE.
   - I saved a great amount of driving.
   - I believe the integration of both types is very convenient.
   - The closer to home, the more convenient it would be and thus more effective by eliminating the travel time.
   - I don't believe a person right out of high school, plus four years of college and summer(s) of trade experience, qualifies to teach in an area vocational school.
   - If they were more convenient. One course was offered on a Friday night plus Saturday which was not feasible for me.

- Many general courses are held in the evenings and are generally inaccessible to us. These courses must be made available to all.

- There is a serious lack of communication and interaction among teachers. They need to be brought together as a group from various schools and areas.

- Availability to those necessary--yes, but the on-campus courses provide a personal connection plus certain cultural education-to-life experiences.

- I feel many courses require an on-campus atmosphere to better assist the student with educational problems. The off-campus courses would leave instructors frustrated and unable to resolve the problems.

CHECKLIST C

Activity: "To provide pedagogical competencies to vocational educators currently teaching but not yet certified. The program provides for individualized training through the use of nationally developed modules. The modules are completed by the teacher concurrently with his/her teaching assignment."

The activity was accomplished through an individualized program for each prospective teacher. The method was opposite to the conventional large group lecture/discussion format used in most university classrooms and off-campus courses. The other unique feature was the use of resident resource persons as well as university field staff for individual assistance and evaluation of competence.

1. Did the field-based preparation program provide a definitive plan for completing your certification requirements?

   - Requirements were never really explained clearly.
   - Things seemed to change after a plan was developed.
   - Somewhat unclear as to long-range goals after Vocational I certification.
   - Only after I spoke to the department chairperson.
   - Certification requirements should be updated. More important for a teacher to know how to use a computer than it is to do a bulletin board.
   - My field resource persons did a fine job although I did keep them on their toes by being "ready" for their reviews at all times. I didn't waste their time and they didn't waste mine.
   - There was a plan, but it was changed several times during the first year.
   - The plan is continually altered because the field resource persons keep changing. This could be a more effective program with consistent personnel.
   - The modules were used toward Vocational I certification only. I would like to see this approach used for Vocational II certification.
   - Everything was "spelled out."
   - A clear outline or guide is followed to achieve the necessary credits.
   - The plan was written out and followed. We always knew what was to be done and in what sequence.
   - Modules were only a part of the requirements.
   - You took courses as they were offered.
   - Everything necessary for completion was explained.
   - At Indiana University even though everything is completed, an intern is still subject to a council of educators review. The council can pass or reject the teacher even though everything was passed.

- There are other considerations such as the competency test and work experience that affect certification, and the information I received on these items was weak.
- Pitt did not offer module-type programs for all vocational studies.
- It offered me a chance for credits without long travel and wasted time.

2. Were the teacher training modules a valuable tool in enabling you to accomplish the needed competencies?

- Requirements in many modules were too complicated and assumed you had prior knowledge about the subject.
- Many modules are meaningless to me and of no help.
- Most modules were good, others need updating.
- Some, with modifications.
- Some but not all.
- Some modules are too indepth for the minor significance of the subject matter.
- In some modules information was vague and provided little help in meeting the evaluative criteria.
- About one-half were valuable.
- They were easy to work with, but the final experience was difficult to validate. A video camera should be used to evaluate the skill being learned.
- The use of videotaping is somewhat invalid.
- Because of our out-of-the-way location I could never have completed the required courses in any other manner.
- I don't know if I would say they were invaluable.
- The modules dwell on abstract policies not the practical everyday problems.
- Not really--some of the modules are of questionable value.
- As a resource.
- Most of the modules were, but some were not.
- To a certain degree.
- Certain modules were busy work.
- Standard classes are better.
- They are handy to have on hand for reference. I use my completed modules constantly.

- There was little need for further explanation after reading the modules.
- A majority of the modules were very helpful.
- Well written and easy to follow.
- It put into practice the needed competencies.
- There should be some method of testing-out through classroom observation by the university field staff for basic level I skills.
- The AAVIM modules are quite useful. The X-modules were not very helpful.
- I had incorporated many of the competencies before using the modules.
- By the time I got through the modules I found that I had done most of the required competencies on my own during my first years of teaching. The modules required me to switch from my system to theirs.
- Modules not arranged in proper order for the beginning teacher.
- By the time I took some of the modules I had already been performing the tasks. Doing the module was just a matter of proving my worth to a field resource person. He/she did not seem at all interested in the fact that you were performing the actual task but rather just recording it in no less than 10 typed pages.
- They force you to do it until you get it right.
- No modules were used.
- Some of the competencies should be changed.
- They provided ideas and suggestions to modify your personal thoughts and viewpoints.
- They helped in the needed competencies, but I feel the feedback one receives in conventional courses is much more beneficial than the modules.

3. Did the field-based program provide for interaction with other vocational teachers at the same level of professional preparation?

- Excellent part of program.
- In group meetings.
- No more than would already be available through normal school contacts.
- Most were on your own to complete the preparation modules.
- Through small group meetings not necessarily involving the modules.
- The small group meetings at Temple were most helpful in this respect.
- Only at small group meetings--not enough.

- At the beginning of the program but not later.
- I was the only person participating in the program from my school.
- There were no other teachers in my school at the same level.
- Not as much as you receive when attending classes. Ideas are limited to interaction with only one person.
- Interaction is limited to fellow teachers at our school who are taking PBTE.
- Yes, this interaction was encouraged.
- At my school there were no other instructors involved with the program. There were meetings held by PBTE interns, but most who attended did not actively participate.
- In the small group meetings.
- I can do that in everyday work situations--why have group meetings?
- Within our own school and several other vocational schools in the northwest area of Pennsylvania.
- Only in the same building. I feel visiting other instructors in related trades would have been helpful.
- The program did not provide for the interaction but rather teachers sought out other teachers.
- Probably the best part of the program.

4. Did the field-based program provide for your understanding of educational issues or problems in teaching?

- A very small amount.
- I had an idea of educational issues and problems before starting the program.
- Often when running into a problem I had to wait a week to get help.
- Yes, in many areas.
- Very well.
- Field resource staff more interested in a theoretical rather than a practical approach.
- A book or class cannot prepare you for human interaction.
- Absolutely not.
- To a degree, you really don't know the problems until you start teaching.
- I felt a little more interaction between students would've been beneficial.

- Not really!
- Only in the general terms. It did not deal in specifics.
- It was a help, but only experience provides a more complete understanding.
- To some extent, however, each district and each school are unique. Some of the field resource persons are not in touch with vocational education issues and problems.
- This may be an area where improvement is needed. The modules deal only with the teaching competencies.
- Yes, my resource person was well versed in the topics and made sure I was cognizant of the same.
- Some of the group meetings were very informative. However, it was difficult to cover all the circumstances in the time allotted.
- The small group discussions were helpful.
- Not exactly, while I did gain insights into PDE policy changes and similar national trends, the perspectives were broad in scope and not specific to my needs.
- Somewhat through my individual work and discussions with others in the program.
- When I had good input from the field resource person my understanding of issues and problems was okay. However, when my new field resource person had no vocational experience and no experience with the modules, I could not receive the necessary input to understand educational issues and problems.

5. Did the field-based program provide for adequate interaction between you and the university staff?

- I only saw my field resource person for approximately 15 to 30 minutes a week and senior resource person once a year at the most.
- Interaction was only with one or two university staff.
- Had four different advisors, some were weak.
- The representatives did not attend our school often enough.
- Our resource person was very good.
- Field resource person makes me feel isolated from rather than a part of the university.
- At times, dependent upon the knowledge and expertise of the resource person assigned to your school.
- Interaction was with the field resource person only.

- Because we are off-campus and "out of sight" many changes occur that we never learn about.
- The staff was very helpful when needed.
- On a weekly basis.
- Only with my resource person.
- Only reacted with the field resource person. The other persons were mediocre.
- Only one out of three representatives made an effort to help, and she was extremely good.
- They were reachable when a need existed.
- The only people I came in contact with were the field resource persons, and I've had three of them in four years.
- Who cares? The university ignores us anyhow.
- One-on-one excellent.
- It was all I could do to make them keep my records straight. Appeared to be an internal university problem.

6. Did the field-based program enable you to utilize the full range of university services normally provided to students in more conventional teacher preparation programs?

- We were promised certain things but never received them.
- I lived 60 miles from the university's main campus; therefore, I could not access all of the campus facilities or staff.
- My university field representative always had or got the information I needed.
- Library and other resources were too far away.
- I loved the modules and found them extremely helpful.
- What services?
- Distance from the university was the problem.
- The program worked out well for me, I wish the rest of the certification could go so smoothly. The modules worked well and having someone come to the school was very convenient. The program also provided a contact person after the CBTE is completed.
- Yes, in the sense that I had access to anything necessary to the program.
- Too far away.

- It's still available but because of travel and time usually not used.
- When I needed the materials, it was just a matter of going to the campus.
- Availability of on-campus resources was limited, but the problem was not the magnitude to seriously hamper course completion.
- That was not expected, vocational people are tradesmen first and educators second. I did not expect to or desire to become a "college student." My expectations were that I would be taught teaching methods, competencies and concepts which is what I got.
- Why would I need them?
- I had to travel 35 miles one way to get to a library to gather information for a research paper.
- I have no idea!
- I have little interest in the services or activities that are too difficult to attend or utilize.
- I am located 100 miles from the university. Not much opportunity for individual study or researching at the library involving education past, present and future.
- Partially, with the use of the resource person and staff member, but obtaining support material for a specific item was delayed two weeks until the staff member brought the material from the university.
- It has been two months and I have not seen any university staff.
- Much less interaction between myself and the university staff.

CHECKLIST D

Activity: "To provide a competency-based internship for students seeking certification as supervisors and directors of vocational education and for students developing curriculum specialist competencies. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity utilized the individualized approach and included the use of nationally developed leadership modules. University support services included weekly meetings with field resource persons and periodic visits by the program's coordinator. Daily on-the-job assistance was provided by a resident leadership resource person in each participant's respective school.

1. Did the field-based leadership program provide you with an internship consistent with your professional preparation program?

   - The leadership modules did not meet the needs and required too much time to complete.
   - The leadership program was not set up for practicing administrators.
   - Did an excellent job.
   - An intern cannot meet the criteria for the listed competencies and teach full time. Any student seeking supervisor or director's certification must be on sabbatical or employed full time in the position. Any competency that must be simulated becomes compromised.

2. Did the field-based leadership program provide a planned set of competencies to be achieved during the internship experience?

   - The competencies are needed to function as an administrator.
   - Too much paperwork! It took time away from teacher preparation time.

3. Was the field-based leadership program less costly to you than a conventional campus-based program would have been?

   - Time and car expenses.
   - Who knows what the campus-based programs would have cost?
   - Same or higher.
   - Travel reduction.

4. Did the field resource and resident leadership persons provide the necessary reinforcement and information to help you achieve success in the program?

   - Not enough time is allowed by the resource persons. A lot of questions are left unanswered. Sometimes I think the resource person should be better trained for the job.
   - Especially the school resource person.

- Excellent!
- I've had five resource persons in a five-year period--some were good but most were terrible.
- Field resource person does not visit our school often enough--he/she visits on a request basis.
- Help was not always immediately available.
- To succeed in the leadership program requires a full-time commitment, and the leadership positions are not worth the effort.
- Did not receive formal instruction but completed module.
- Mr. Silkman brought a wealth of administrative knowledge to my competencies.

5. Did your internship provide you with the opportunity to apply theoretical principles in practical situations?
   - Not always. Sometimes instruction had to be planned around the modules.
6. Was the university instrumental in helping you secure a suitable internship?
   - Mine was very good, but now the program is not suitable.
   - Already was employed as an instructor.
   - I did it myself. I enrolled in Pitt's program after securing a teacher aide position as an exploratory situation to see if I would like teaching in my trade area.
   - Not enough contact with my advisor.

CHECKLIST E

Activity: "To provide a competency-based program for teaching the necessary instructor competencies for establishing and operating vocational student organizations. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity used the field-based approach to provide instructors with the necessary competencies for helping students to work within organizations as well as organize and operate them. The training approach used both simulation and application in the classroom to bring instructors to the desired competence.

1. Did the field-based program provide you with the competencies necessary to organize and operate a vocational student organization?

   - Through modules and small group meetings.
   - There were a few modules on this activity in the series of modules I completed. It was not, however, a complete program.
   - Although our school policy is not to have such organizations, I learned how to establish and operate them.
   - Not offered as part of the CBTE courses, but I wish it had been.

2. Would an in-service workshop be as effective as the field-based approach in providing the vocational student organization competencies?

   - Requirements in some of the programs were to do modules that stated, "Start a vocational student organization." It was impossible to start another organization when one was already in place.
   - Could be an effective tool if used in conjunction with the field-based approach.
   - A workshop should be provided at least once a year.
   - It should be tried in order to make an accurate judgment.
   - Each vocational school has a distinct population of students with specific needs. The field-based program helps to address the needs better than an in-service.

3. Was the mastery of competencies in organizing and operating vocational student organizations required for the completion of your teacher preparation program?

   - An elective, but I feel everyone should take this course.
   - Need more instruction in financial administration.
   - Well done.
   - Only two modules.
   - We don't have any student organizations in our school per administrative order.

- As part of a course that utilized specific modules on the topic.

4. Was formal instruction in organizing and operating a vocational student organization really necessary?

   - Since the state wants youth clubs, you must know how to organize and operate them.
   - The FFA has a very complex system of record books, projects, etc., that I never was really prepared for through Temple University.
   - A person from industry is not necessarily familiar with the vocational student organization.
   - Previous teaching experiences were all classroom related--I had no background in student organizations.
   - May have been more valuable for someone who tended not to get very involved with student organizations.
   - Formal instruction would help.
   - Formal training in this area is helpful only if the instructor is motivated to participate in youth organizations.
   - Every teacher that has no skills to organize should have this instruction.
   - Not at our school. Although I think these organizations are important and helpful to the students.
   - The experienced teachers at the school were my biggest aid in learning to work with students.

5. Do you presently advise a vocational student organization?

   - I helped to organize our shop's VICA club.
   - As an assistant.
   - I did for two years.
   - None at our school.

6. Do you feel competence in organizing and operating vocational student organizations should be a requirement in teacher preparation programs?

   - If the state is going to provide state-level leadership and assistance for youth clubs, the competencies are necessary.
   - Desire to get involved with youth clubs is more important than formal instructor training.
   - Should be an elective that would count toward certification of teacher.
   - If each teacher were educated to the needs and demands of vocational student organizations, they would be much more willing to become advisors and willing to insure the program's success.

- There are many more important areas for the beginning teacher to study.
- It should be a highly supported area.
- Good for the students and the school.
- Current time restrictions on the classes offered are limited and any time lost due to meetings is time taken from technical instruction.
- I do not feel the competencies are as important as having an interest in our young students of today.
- If the student organizations are to be an integral part of the curriculum, then vocational instructors must get training.

CHECKLIST F

Activity: "To provide assistance to beginning teachers including persons with baccalaureate degrees in solving a wide variety of professional problems. The program utilizes the same delivery system as FB-CBTE."

The activity was designed to help first-year vocational teachers in comprehensive high schools. The program operated in local schools and involved field resource persons working with the new teacher through the use of nationally developed modules. The modules selected for completion by the new teacher were based on individual needs assessments. Each individual was cycled through the identified modules until all were completed.

1. Did university field staff assist you in selecting the teacher preparation modules?

   - The modules were selected by the university. I had no input in their selection.
   - Required selection.
   - Given a list to complete.
   - The modules were selected for me.
   - Many modules were selected by the university.
   - They were helpful using their personal background and experience.
   - In the sense that the program was already set.
   - You were required to do certain ones.
   - My field resource person is not aware of the needs of the vocational education teacher. He/she must be a former English teacher. He/she doesn't care about the task being done correctly but rather completing the forms.

2. Were the modules relevant to your professional needs?

   - Not at all.
   - They were not geared to a person who has a bachelor's degree.
   - Only some.
   - Some were good, others I never used after they were finished.
   - Early modules were very helpful, but later ones were not as useful.
   - I made them a part of my professional needs.
   - I thought the modules were redundant and professional nurses could get along without participating in FB-CBTE. These individuals spend four years learning the "nursing process," which is no different than the "teaching process."

- Some were, others were not.
- To a great extent, however, some were not necessarily helpful in my field.
- The modules were well prepared and filled my needs at the time.

3. Did you receive your baccalaureate degree before participating in the program?

   - No comments.

4. Did resource personnel provide continual support as you proceeded through the selected modules?

   - He/she spent about five to 10 minutes here a week.
   - Some of the time the field resource person was a real help, other times not.
   - Very, very disorganized advise.
   - Once a week was not always enough.
   - Some did, some did not.
   - Very helpful, it tied my classroom work to the modules.
   - Very much so.
   - Weekly or biweekly as necessary.
   - Don't need them.
   - There was a resource person in my school that provided me with the necessary support.

5. Did you complete all the modules identified to meet your professional needs?

   - Certification needs--not professional needs.
   - I have additional work ahead in this area.
   - Currently working toward this goal.
   - I had excellent directions.
   - I still have a few to finish.
   - I have completed all identified modules to date.
   - Also completed courses for a second B. S. degree in education with a major in vocational education.

6. Did the evaluative procedures in the program provide an effective feedback mechanism in helping you complete the program?

   - At times tapes were helpful.

- The self-evaluation form and procedure are extremely confusing because of their subjectivity.
- Comments by my instructor were relevant to my teaching experiences.
- This is probably the weak link in the program. I would suggest more interaction-type courses where discussion among teachers, both new and experienced, could take place.
- Corrective action taken on my part to meet requirements of each module.
- The checklists provided in the modules showed your strength and weaknesses.

CHECKLIST G

Activity: "To provide assistance to prospective vocational teachers in making the difficult transition from industry to the vocational classroom/laboratory."

The activity was designed to get participants involved in learning experiences that were identified as being essential in the first few weeks of teaching. An added benefit of the program was the direct articulation with the vocational instructional certificate program. Thus, the accomplished skills were applied toward the teaching certificate.

1. Were the learning activities you experienced as an intern useful to you as a vocational teacher?

   - Very limited.
   - Some of the techniques were useful, but the thrust of the techniques were directed toward lecture.
   - In many areas.
   - VITAL program provided me the opportunity to learn necessary teaching skills.
   - Some were nothing but busy work with little or no meaning.
   - I could not have done it without them.
   - I really think these activities should be learned before one enters the classroom.
   - Being an intern teacher is the only way to experience the daily activities of teaching.
   - The activities helped me master the basics of teaching (lesson plans, course organization).

2. Was the intern program of sufficient length for you to master the essential teaching skills?

   - Too long at times.
   - You can only master teaching with experience, books only help.
   - The AVTS program is sink or swim. I'm learning as fast as I can so I don't sink.
   - They require too much unnecessary work, but they do provide information that helps.
   - I saw no difference in being an intern and a regular teacher. The essential teaching skills had to be applied from day one. Had it not been for some lay instructor's experience I don't know how I would have done it.
   - It could have been longer.

- The length was okay, I am not finished as yet; but with problems of having four different field resource persons across two semesters, I could not learn as fast as I might have under one person. The constant changing of field resource persons resulted in changing and adapting to new ways.

- No, because at this time I am on a half-time teaching basis and scheduling with the resource person is difficult, thus I see some problems.

3. Do the recent changes in teacher certification (e.g., induction process, extra credits to qualify and maintain a teaching certificate, etc.) negate the need for an intern teacher program?

   - Program is needed.

   - I would like to see preservice student teaching to ease them into teaching.

   - Perhaps the induction process will serve as a replacement; however, since it involves on-staff teachers and works on the "big sister or brother concept," an introduction to the certification process at respective universities is still necessary. The extra certification and continuing education credits seem to serve no other purpose than to squelch many academicians' fears that people will discover the vocational certification process via competency attainment is far and away the best method of learning classroom teaching skills.

   - In vocational education, yes I am not sure about academics.

   - I am not aware of these.

4. Were the competencies mastered in your internship applied toward your vocational instruction certificate?

   - The competencies were applied to my Business Education degree.

5. Was the transition from industry to the vocational classroom a difficult one for you?

   - No! Because as an owner of my business I had to instruct employees in all phases of the building trades.

   - Very difficult transition.

   - It takes a lot of hard work.

   - I would never do it again.

   - In some ways. My prior job was on the road repairing appliances in the home, being confined to one room as a teacher is difficult.

   - I had taught in industry for several years.

   - I was an educational director and instructor for six years at a private school.

   - While at a trade school, I was involved with the tutoring service at the school and in helping fellow classmates understand the material.

- With the quality of student and paperwork needed today, the transition gets tougher all the time.

- I had some private sector teaching experience.

- I was good at what I was doing. I was a top-rated lead lineman and would go to work day after day with little or no preparation. Not so in the vocational classroom. I now burn the midnight oil preparing for tomorrow's classes.

- I like teaching and I'm excited about my trade.

- Extremely! Teachers are left to flounder on their own if hired late.

6. Would courses in teaching methods enable you to master the competencies provided in the intern program?

- It was more convenient for me to do it through a field-based preparation program.

- I had some prior experience teaching part-time vocational courses for the Community College of Allegheny County before accepting this position.

- The classroom is the best teacher. The time spent in the classroom as an intern was very helpful.

- The modules were excellent in providing the competencies.

- VITAL program enables you to master the competencies.

- These courses must stress the importance of motivation of the teacher as well as the student. Along with this, updated methods in the use of computers and VCR equipment should be stressed.

- Not a formal course, but field-based might be beneficial.

- Not as well. The very concept of vocational education is exactly what the field-based program does.

- Backed up by applied studies.

- No more new courses, let me do my job.

- I had some problems: not enough equipment, some "problem" students and starting at the end of a school year. However, I believe the hardest thing I had to overcome was adapting to the low expectations of students and their low abilities.

CHECKLIST H

Activity: "To provide an economical system whereby beginning teachers, usually from business and industry, could meet the state's requirements for certification (tuition differential)."

The activity was really a fiscal one whereby teacher education courses labeled "vocational" were subsidized with federal monies resulting in substantially lower tuition for the student. The intent of the reduced tuition was to entice business and industry personnel into vocational teaching by helping them meet the costs of teacher preparation required for certification.

1. Was the tuition differential a contributing factor in your becoming a vocational teacher?

   - Would be nice, but Temple does not offer a lower rate.
   - Not in effect when I took the program.
   - When did this happen, I have, to the best of my knowledge, paid full tuition. The same applies to other students at this university.
   - I was not aware of the tuition differential.
   - Never heard of this program.
   - Our school has a tuition refund policy.
   - I never received any tuition reduction.

2. Do you believe individuals leaving industry to become vocational teachers should receive a tuition differential for their course work?

   - Most school districts have built-in programs for continuing education.
   - Most of them are married with families and with heavier financial responsibilities such as the education of their own children.
   - It could be helpful, but the biggest thing would be higher salaries.
   - Transition usually involves a cut in pay.
   - For certification only--not for a degree.
   - If they use the modular method.
   - Leaving industry usually means a cut in salary plus six credits a semester at $100 per credit for the VITAL and/or Mastery courses. That is quite a pay cut for an individual.
   - To ensure that quality personnel become instructors, otherwise there is little enticement.
   - I was financially exhausted after paying the full cost of tuition on a beginning teacher's salary. I was paying about $800 per year to keep a $14,000 job.

- It would be the best way to lure quality people into our vocational system.
- Nothing different than others working toward their permanent certification.
- It would help the teacher out financially, because now he is at the bottom of the pay scale and extra money is short.
- Most industries pay a part of further education.
- Leaving the trade to become an instructor resulted in quite a substantial pay loss for me. Although in the long term I believe it was a good choice, the first few years will be quite difficult financially.

3. Does the lack of a current tuition differential deter vocational teachers from continuing their professional growth through university-sponsored courses?

- In many cases yes--money is tight and teaching salaries make continuing professional growth tough.
- It is always helpful to keep costs low.
- Not qualified to give an opinion.
- Our intermediate unit pays tuition.
- I would guess yes.
- I would like to get it over with as soon as possible.
- At $115 per semester hour plus books, transportation and parking fee who needs "professional growth."
- Just makes it harder to pay for the classes.
- With the high cost of credits and the time necessary to obtain them, it is easy to understand why most teachers don't progress much beyond the minimum requirements.
- Unfortunately after I receive the required credits, I will discontinue my education. It's almost impossible to support a family and pay for an education on a teacher's salary.
- I think deter may be too strong. There is, however, an effect.
- Support should come from the local schools to promote their teachers' professional development.
- It is always helpful to keep costs low by partially paying tuition costs.
- Very definitely yes! I cannot afford to take any more than necessary to maintain employment.
- The starting salary for a teacher in this area is lower than unemployment compensation and makes vocational teaching nearly prohibitive.
- I can only take a limited number of credits each year due to the cost.

- If you want a job in vocational education, you have no choice but to pay for the courses or you don't have a job. It certainly would help to have a differential.

4. Were you aware that a tuition differential was in effect for vocational courses offered through certain universities?

   - I was aware it was available at one time (late 60s, early 70s) but not now.
   - Once again, this is helpful to adults.
   - Without financial help the supply of competent people will stop.
   - Only after full certification is reimbursement for tuition available at my school.

5. Do you believe a tuition differential is necessary to maintain an adequate supply of vocational teachers?

   - It would help to get more good people into the profession who otherwise could not afford it.
   - Desire and interest are the key factors.
   - Yes--with the present vocational teacher pay scale.
   - Don't know.
   - It would help!
   - Definitely!
   - Tuition differential plus an equitable minimum starting salary is needed to insure quality education.
   - Not if local schools show initiative to help their teachers with financial assistance.
   - The cost is overwhelming to become a vocational teacher. If teachers must go on half time with a subsequent reduction in pay, it is difficult to pay for and get the required credits in the timeframe set by the state.
   - You take a pay cut to be a vocational teacher.
   - With everyone (PDE included) trying their best to drown vocational education, we may soon be oversupplied.
   - To put it simply: you get what you pay for! I am not speaking of quantity but quality of new teachers.
   - If you don't, you will only get people who are <u>not</u> successful in industry.
   - For some people it may be the deciding factor.

6. Should a tuition differential be reinstituted at the four vocational teacher preparation centers on a restricted basis?

- The state is giving money to less important areas of education. Why not put money where the need is and will be in the coming years.
- If taught by individuals with many years as a vocational teacher.
- The tuition differential was an incentive to keep the quality of vocational education alive.
- What restrictions?
- Should be for vocational teachers.
- Should be allowed for all vocational courses and students regardless of full time or part time.
- Most definitely, most vocational education personnel would pursue the B. S. degree if it weren't so expensive.
- It would be a positive step.
- Personally, I would enroll in graduate courses if the tuition was subsidized.
- Please! Also student grants for new teachers to help subsidize their income while working on teaching certificates.
- Restrictions on what grounds and what teachers--all teachers in vocational education should be given the differential.
- Why restrict it?
- Depends on the meaning of restricted.
- We all need to improve our capability to perform successfully. The tuition differential is an incentive to keep the quality of vocational education alive.
- Definitely needed for first 60 credits.
- How restrictive? Any cut in costs would be helpful to those choosing a career.
- Possibly, if the local schools cannot finance this type of assistance.